

4408. Also, resolution of the Wayne County Board of Supervisors, representing a county-wide population of approximately 2,165,468, including the city of Detroit, requesting the immediate enactment of mustering-out legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4409. Also, resolution of the delegates representing the American Legion Post of the Department of Michigan, recommending that aviation bills, H. R. 3420 and H. R. 3421, and all other legislation affecting civil aviation now pending in Congress be held in abeyance until the termination of the present war and for a period of 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4410. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Frank Bernier, of Auburn, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4411. Also, petition of Ruby Dorgen, of Auburn, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4412. Also, petition of Aldouin Houle, of Lewiston, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4413. Also, petition of Thomas Buton, of Auburn, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4414. Also, petition of Arthur A. Bembe, of Lewiston, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4415. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Women's National Democratic Club, Inc., of New York, endorsing the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution which would guarantee to women equal rights with men under the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4416. Also, resolution of the Allied Civic Associations of Forest Hills, N. Y., that present-day activities of the black market whereby hijackers and racketeers are profiting at the expense of the people of this Nation on the necessities of life, it is necessary that Congress awaken and produce the evidence of these violations and prosecute the guilty violators of our laws; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4417. Also, resolution of the Queens County Civic Councils, Inc., of New York, that this organization opposes any increase in the immigration quota and recommends that 6 months after the war all refugees be returned to their respective countries; also opposing any form of prohibition and the return of bootlegging and racketeering; recommending that all service men and women having served at least 6 months in the armed forces of the United States receive 1 year's advanced pay on his or her honorable discharge; and that this organization recommends the soldiers' vote, provided it is conducted by the States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4418. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. William T. Parsons and other citizens of Chester, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4419. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of 100 residents of the Fifth District of Michigan opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4420. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Jewish Community Council of Houston, Tex.,

petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the withdrawal of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4421. Also, petition of the vice president of the Cortlandt Democratic Club, Croton on Hudson, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to President Roosevelt's five-point program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4422. Also, petition of the chief clerk of the City Council of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the soldier vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4423. Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, N. Y., American Youth for Democracy, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Green-Lucas bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4424. Also, petition of the Missouri Pension Society, St. Joseph, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4425. Also, petition of the Fresno Labor Council, Fresno, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Green-Lucas voting bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4426. Also, petition of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, Phoenix, Ariz., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to world-wide aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 11, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Fred S. Buschmeyer, pastor of the Mount Pleasant Congregational Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal Creator, whose endless beginnings are the hope of our hearts and the solace of our souls, we thank Thee for the pattern of ceaseless creative endeavor which Thou hast set before us. Thou, who didst stand behind creation's dawn, and at whose holy bidding the ancient stars didst assume their courses, dost still stand behind the dawn of each new day, and dost still work with recreating power throughout all this living universe, our home.

Though Thy creative hand was old in practice when our Nation was born, still we feel the freshness and the power of Thy touch upon our lives in these later years, and our hope for the future still rests in Thy leadings.

Out of confusion and failure and disaster Thou art ever creating new possibilities of life and growth and noble achievement. We thank Thee that by Thy grace the marching days and the sequent seasons bring to us fresh chances to build upon our own efforts of the past, to correct the errors of our yesterdays, and to redeem the lost opportunities of receding years.

Grant to us with each new day a consciousness of the holy heritage Thou hast

visited upon us, that as the children of Thy spirit we, too, may make each day a drama of creative power, of fresh beginnings, in companionship with Thee. In humility and in hope, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, January 19, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 108) making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1543) to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3741) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

ATTITUDE OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION ON AMENDMENT TO REVENUE BILL—CORRECTION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, at page 197 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1944, in connection with an amendment which was offered, it was stated by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, reading from a memorandum which had been given to him, that the amendment was recommended by the War Shipping Administration, and so forth. Admiral Land, the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, has addressed to me a letter in which he says the War Shipping Administration had no objection to the amendment and so advised the Treasury, but that they had not asked for the amendment, following their policy of noninterference in tax matters. In order that the matter may be clearly understood, I ask to have Admiral Land's letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I regret the fact that the memorandum stated that the amendment had been asked for by the War Shipping Administration, but it appears that that organization had no objection to the amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, January 18, 1944.
The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: At page 197 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1944, you are reported as having stated:

"The War Shipping Administration asked for an amendment exempting from the tax imposed on the transportation of property

by section 3475 of the Internal Revenue Code, amounts paid to or by the War Shipping Administration for the transportation of property by water from one point in the United States to another, except between points on the Great Lakes."

Under the amendment to which you referred, amounts paid by or to the War Shipping Administration for the transportation of property by water from one point in the United States to another would be exempt from the Federal transportation tax.

It is our policy in tax matters to suggest amendments to the tax law only when existing practices unduly interfere with the effective prosecution of the duties of the War Shipping Administration in the war effort. In all other cases we prefer to leave matters of tax policy to those branches of the Federal Government charged with responsibility therefor.

In line with this policy we did not ask for the amendment. We did, however, state to the Treasury Department that the War Shipping Administration had no objection to an amendment which would substantially restore the situation as it existed prior to December 1, 1943, when payments of transportation charges by or to the War Shipping Administration were exempt from the transportation tax. We also advised the Treasury that the language of the proposed amendment would, in our opinion, accomplish that objective.

It is our understanding that the amendment was suggested by certain shippers who felt that the result of the taxes as applied to those interests was unfair and inequitable. We at no time had any communication with any committee of Congress or any Member thereof regarding this suggestion. Our participation was limited merely to informal advice to the Treasury Department that we would have no objection to the suggested amendment if they felt it was otherwise desirable. Obviously, we could not take an affirmative position on a revenue matter in which we had no real interest.

We know that you would want to have before you a statement of the position of the War Shipping Administration with respect to our policy on tax legislation and the proposed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND,
Administrator.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Bailey	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bridges	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Walgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Downey	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	
Gillette	Overton	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent because of a slight cold.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT, pursuant to law, appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, and Mr. BROOKS as members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

RELIEF OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYEES FROM LIABILITY FOR OVERPAYMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer (with accompanying papers) which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Ottawa County, Mich., requesting that action on House bill 3420, affecting air commerce, and similar proposed legislation be deferred until after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation enabling all members of the armed forces who are residents of Wisconsin to cast their votes for the selection of representatives in the Government; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Atchison, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—MEMORIALS FROM WISCONSIN

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent to present memorials signed by

citizens of Wisconsin remonstrating against the enactment of any prohibition legislation. I ask that the heading of one of the memorials may be printed in the Record and that the memorials be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the memorials were received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the heading of one of the memorials was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE COUNCIL OF BREWERY AND SOFT-DRINK WORKERS PROTEST AGAINST THE ENACTMENT OF ANY AND ALL PROHIBITION LEGISLATION—OPPOSED TO PROHIBITION OR THE PASSAGE OF ANY LAW THAT WILL INTERFERE WITH THE PERSONAL LIBERTY OR ECONOMIC WELFARE OF THE WORKING CLASS

Whereas the professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force the consideration and passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; and

Whereas these same prohibitionists are also sponsoring legislation which would bring back prohibition by banning the sale of beer to our fighting forces in and near military camps, as well as to civilians in zones around such camps; and

Whereas the object of all such legislation is to reestablish complete national prohibition in the United States during the absence from their homes of more than 8,000,000 citizens in the military service of their country; and

Whereas any such legislation is opposed by the War and Navy Departments as well as by the great majority of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians; and

Whereas national prohibition, during a test of 13 years from 1920 to 1933, brought upon the Nation the uncontrollable evils of the speak-easy and the bootlegger, the degradation of teen-age girls and boys, nationwide home manufacture of illegal liquor, widespread vicious crime, official corruption, and disrespect for law—all of which so outraged public decency that the eighteenth amendment was repealed by a majority of 10,000,000 votes; and

Whereas the enactment of any such legislation would completely destroy all legalized control and cause the loss of Federal revenues of more than \$1,500,000,000 a year and local revenues of \$500,000,000 a year without any compensating benefits to either State or Nation; and

Therefore we, the undersigned citizens of the United States, protest against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and herewith request our Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all such proposed legislation. We further respectfully request that this petition be referred to the proper committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXCHANGE AND COLLECTION COSTS BETWEEN BANKS—RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA BOARD OF BANK CONTROL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Board of Bank Control of the State of South Carolina, which shows the serious trouble that will come to many of our small banks unless the interpretation of regulation Q of the Federal Reserve System is revoked.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the recent interpretation by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of regulation Q will materially affect the present well-ordered operation of the banking institutions in South Carolina: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Board that the Congress should immediately take the necessary action to return the matter of exchange and collection costs between banks to the status existing before the present interpretation of the Federal Reserve Board became effective; and further,

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Congress.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. MALONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO THE REVENUE ACT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. McCARRAN to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 38, line 4, insert the following: "(y) (2) Deferred maintenance deduction—carriers: The deduction for deferred maintenance provided in section 128 (B)."

On page 67, line 1, insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 128 the following new section:

"SEC. 128 (B). (a) Deferred maintenance deduction—carriers: In computing the net income of any carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, there shall be allowed as a deduction, in addition to deductions otherwise provided for in this chapter, the amount which such carrier shall, pursuant to authorization of the Interstate Commerce Commission, accrue in its maintenance reserve account to provide for the cost of maintenance and repairs which it is unable to undertake or complete in any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1942: *Provided*, That United States Treasury securities shall be set aside and held by the taxpayer in a face amount at all times not less than the balance in said maintenance reserve account: *Provided further*, That expenditures subsequently made on account of any maintenance or repairs for which accruals have been made in said reserve account shall be charged against said account and shall not be deductible in the determination of net income, except to the extent provided in subsection (b) hereof.

"(b) The deduction provided in subsection (a) of this section may be taken in any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1942, but may not be taken in any taxable year beginning after December 31 in the year in which the President shall issue his proclamation declaring the war to be at an end. Any amount remaining in the maintenance reserve account on December 31 of the fifth year following the year in which the President shall issue his proclamation as aforesaid shall be included in the gross income of the taxpayer in the 5th year following the

issuance of such proclamation and shall be taxed at the rate or rates applicable to the last year or years in which an equivalent amount of deduction was allowed, with interest at the rate or rates borne by the Treasury securities remaining in the taxpayer's treasury. Upon inclusion of such remaining amount in its gross income, any expenditures subsequently made on account of deferred maintenance and repairs shall be deductible under section 23 (a), and the taxpayer shall be relieved of any further obligation to hold Treasury securities under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section."

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. WAGNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 240), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the amount authorized to be expended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, pursuant to Senate Resolution 42, agreed to January 18, 1943, is hereby increased by \$12,000.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONTRACT TERMINATION OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 241), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Subcommittee on Contract Termination of the Committee on Military Affairs be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the first session, on S. 1268, a bill to facilitate the termination of war contracts; S. 1280, a bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; and Senate Joint Resolution 80, a joint resolution to prohibit the use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting in connection with war contracts.

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day dinner address delivered by Senator Lucas at a meeting of Democrats of Sangamon County, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS BEFORE NATIONAL FOOD AND VEGETABLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Food and Vegetable Growers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., on January 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION FOR WAR—ADDRESS BY DONALD M. NELSON

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Donald M. Nelson at a dinner given in his honor on the occasion of the second anniversary of the War Production Board, Washington, D. C., January 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OVERCOMING OF GROUP ANIMOSITIES—DISCUSSION ON AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion on the American Forum of the Air entitled "How Can We Overcome Group Animosi-

ties?" on January 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES SAFEGUARD AGAINST INFLATION—LETTER OF HERBERT M. SINGER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Herbert M. Singer, published in the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller, in the issue of November 1, 1944, under the heading, "Subsidies Called Practical Safeguard Against Inflation," which appears in the Appendix.]

OLEOMARGARINE — EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Oleomargarine," published in the Washington Post of January 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN AVIATORS OVER GREECE—INTERVIEW WITH LT. FRANK D. BUEHL

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by James J. Kay, from the National Herald, a Greek newspaper of New York, issue of December 26, 1943, containing an interview with Lt. Frank D. Buehl, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLISH BOUNDARY QUESTION—EDITORIAL AND NEWS DISPATCH

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Polish-Russian Realities," published in the Washington Star of January 19, 1944, and an Associated Press dispatch from Baltimore, dated January 19, entitled "Monsignor Sheen Views Poland as Moral Test," which appear in the Appendix.]

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY, GEN. ISAIAS MEDINA ANGARITA, PRESIDENT OF VENEZUELA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I announced yesterday afternoon, at a quarter past 12 today we are to be visited by the President of Venezuela, who will deliver a brief address. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Vice President appoint a committee of four Members of the Senate to escort the President of Venezuela into the Chamber, and that thereafter, until the ceremonies shall be concluded, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], as the committee to greet the President of Venezuela and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency, Gen. Isaias Medina Angarita, President of Venezuela, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk.

The members of the party accompanying the President of Venezuela, including Señor Don Rodolfo Rojas, Minister of

the Treasury; Señor Dr. Manuel Silveira, Minister of Public Works; Señor Dr. Gustavo Manrique-Pacanins, Attorney General; Commander Antonio Picardi, Chief of the Naval Division of the Ministry of War and Navy; Señor Don Eugenio Mendoza, former Minister of National Development; Señor Dr. Manuel Pérez-Guerrero, Acting Secretary to the President; Col. Alfredo Jurado, Aide to the President; Ensign Elio Quintero-Medina, Aide to the President; His Excellency Señor Dr. Don Diógenes Escalante, Ambassador of Venezuela to the United States; Hon. Frank P. Corrigan, American Ambassador to Venezuela; Brig. Gen. Norman Randolph, United States Army, military aide; Capt. Henry T. Richter, United States Navy, naval aide; Mr. Stanley Woodward, Department of State; Col. Nicholas H. E. Campanole, United States Army; Mr. M. Hamilton Osborne, special agent, Department of State, entered the Chamber, and were escorted to the seats assigned them to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, ladies and gentlemen, the President of Venezuela.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF VENEZUELA

Señor Presidente, Señoras y Señores, llego a esta tribuna preclara, penetrado del hondo sentimiento de la unidad americana, a traer en mi voz de ciudadano de América, el saludo fraternal de un pueblo que se enorgullece de haber contribuido, tanto como el que más, con sangre, pensamiento y sacrificio, a la forja de los principios y de las realidades sobre los que se asienta la solidaridad continental. Yo os traigo el saludo muy cordial que os envía un pueblo que entiende y comparte vuestras aspiraciones; que ha luchado por ellas y que está dispuesto a sostener ideales y principios que nos son comunes.

Llego ante vosotros como el jefe legítimo de la democracia venezolana, de un país pequeño todavía por su población y su desarrollo, pero grande por su extensión, por la magnitud de sus recursos materiales, por la altura de sus principios y por su incomparable aporte a la historia de América. La Patria de Simón Bolívar vive hoy una de las épocas más interesantes de su vida. Estamos construyendo nuestro porvenir y recuperando el tiempo perdido con una velocidad y en una forma que inspiran fe y provocan entusiasmo; y estamos haciéndolo manteniendo, en todo su esplendor, las instituciones que garantizan la libertad y la dignidad del hombre y la justicia como norma en las relaciones de la vida social y económica, porque nuestro ideal democrático no se limita a las palabras y no consiste en una mera fachada, más o menos compuesta para impresionar la opinión exterior, sino que consiste en hechos, en realidades, en la forma y en la substancia de la vida de un pueblo. Venezuela es un país libre, donde todos los ciudadanos disfrutan de la libertad civil y política y de todas las garantías que pautan las leyes y en el que la soberanía reside en el pueblo y se ejerce por

medio del sufragio en la persona de mandatarios sinceramente representativos. Por eso, cuando el pueblo venezolano o su Gobierno aseguran que luchan por la democracia y que cooperan por el triunfo de la democracia, no hacen sino revelar la verdadera situación de una colectividad de seres humanos que defienden y están dispuestos a defender, no remotos ideales, sino bienes altamente apreciables que constituyen la realidad de todos sus días.

Esos principios, esa profesión de fe, y la vecindad geográfica son las causas determinantes del sentimiento de simpatía que nos une a vosotros. Miramos en esta augusta asamblea el monumento vivo y fecundo a la voluntad de un pueblo que implantó en la historia el Gobierno democrático y representativo. Vuestro ejemplo inspiró a los grandes hombres que, con su heroico esfuerzo, construyeron nuestras Patrias. La causa de la justicia halló siempre voz robusta en vuestro seno, y todavía resuena en la memoria inmarcescible de nuestra gratitud la noble voz de Henry Clay abogando por la independencia de nuestras Repúblicas americanas.

Los nobles principios que tienen su altar en esta casa, que es el corazón de un gran pueblo, no han de sufrir eclipse, ni mengua. Por eso venimos confiados, sin recelo de la desproporción de nuestras fuerzas. Aspiramos a vivir en un mundo regido por la justicia y por el derecho, ofreciéndonos mutua ayuda, mutuo respeto y mutua confianza. A la sombra benéfica de esos principios, que es la sombra misma del gran árbol de la solidaridad americana, viene ante vosotros, con toda lealtad y firmeza, la ratificación de la amistad fraternal de Venezuela. Ni queremos ser engañados ni engañamos. Con buena fe entera servimos la causa de la democracia y de la justicia que sabemos es, también, la vuestra. No tenemos segundas intenciones. Ni en el pasado ni en el presente hemos hecho negocio con nuestros ideales, y podemos afirmar que nuestra adhesión y nuestra amistad no llevan sombra de interés mezquino. Nunca hemos pedido nada; nunca hemos aceptado nada que no hayamos pagado íntegramente y nuestra amistad, por el contrario, se traduce en inmensa ayuda material para la causa por la cual vuestros hijos ofrecen sus vidas. Por eso es sólido la base sobre la cual nos acercamos y es firme la mano de amigo que os tendemos.

Nada tiene de extraño que, amigos de ayer, seamos amigos de hoy, ya que la misma igualdad de ideales que teníamos en el pasado existe en el presente, y que las únicas cuentas pendientes entre nuestros dos países son las que derivan de la caballería, de las nobles acciones, de la rectitud de intención en nuestro trato internacional. Nuestra actitud de hoy es la misma de siempre. Por eso, desde el primer momento del criminal ataque de Pearl Harbor, nos colocamos a vuestro lado. La causa que defendéis es causa común de los pueblos democráticos. Además de las potencias de ultramar, os acompañan, por convicción, por su propio interés, por la defensa de su tradición y por su

libertad futura, las Repúblicas del Hemisferio, que de ese modo cumplen la palabra que voluntariamente dieron ayer, cuando aun no se sabía contra qué iría dirigida la primera agresión continental. Si Venezuela se situó sin vacilaciones a vuestro lado, no fué para ofreceros solamente el muy valioso apoyo moral de un pueblo independiente, sino para contribuir también de manera efectiva al esfuerzo bélico colectivo y para compartir con vosotros los padecimientos que, en mayor o menor grado, necesariamente han de afectarnos. Os hemos dado y os damos hoy todo lo que podemos. Las materias primas y artículos de primera necesidad disponibles, están a la orden de las Naciones Unidas. Nuestro petróleo, afortunadamente abundante, ha ido y seguirá yendo hasta los campos de batalla, del lado de las democracias. Además de nuestra ayuda material, cooperamos con vosotros en el estudio y realización coordinada de muchos otros proyectos y problemas comunes, y nuestra contribución en el período de la reconstrucción de posguerra será tan amplia y efectiva como nos lo permitan nuestros medios, pues comprendemos que en ello va la libertad de todos, la seguridad futura y el progreso y la supervivencia de la vida libre que soñaron los gloriosos fundadores de nuestras naciones. Mi Gobierno ha estudiado con el mayor interés cuanto se refiere a nuestra participación en la causa de todos, y estamos convencidos de que nuestra posición y actitud de hoy nos permitirán todo cuanto pueden las fuerzas del país.

De Simón Bolívar hemos heredado la conciencia de la unidad de América, fortalecida por el hecho inquebrantable de la geografía y por la comunidad de intereses y de ideales. Los tiempos presentes nos atraen aún a mayor acercamiento y podéis estar seguros de que es el pueblo todo de mi Patria el que hoy, por mi boca, os dice: Venezuela está con vosotros hoy, mañana y siempre, para la causa de la justicia, de la democracia y de la felicidad del hombre.

[Prolonged applause, Senators, distinguished visitors, and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The English translation of the address by the President of Venezuela is as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, filled with the deep sense of American unity, I come to this most illustrious rostrum to convey to you—with my voice of a citizen of the Americas—the fraternal greetings of a people proud to have contributed as much as any other, with blood, thoughts, and sacrifices, to establish those principles and realities upon which our continental solidarity stands. I bring to you the most cordial greetings from a people who understands and shares your aspirations, who has fought for them, and is ready to support those principles and ideals common to both of us.

I come to you as the head of the Venezuelan democracy, of a country still small in population and development, but large in territory, rich in material resources, great in the loftiness of its prin-

ciples and in its matchless contribution to the history of America. The fatherland of Simon Bolivar is living today one of the most interesting moments of its life. We are now building our future and making up for lost time at such a rate and in such a way as to inspire confidence and arouse enthusiasm; and we are doing it while preserving in all their splendor the institutions that guarantee the freedom and the dignity of man and justice as the standard of social and economic life, for our democratic ideal is not limited to words and is not a mere front shaped more or less to impress foreign opinion, but consists of the facts, the realities, the form, and substance of the actual life of a people. Venezuela is a free country where every citizen enjoys civil and political liberty and all the guaranties within the law, and where sovereignty resides in the people and is carried out through suffrage by truly representative mandatories. And so, when the people of Venezuela or its Government state that they are fighting for democracy and cooperating in the victory of democracy, they do nothing else than disclose the real position of a collectivity of human beings who are defending and are ready to defend, not remote ideals, but highly prized possessions which are the reality of their everyday life.

Those principles, that creed, and the geographic vicinity are the determining reasons for the sympathetic feeling that binds us to you. In this august assembly we see the living and fruitful monument to the will of the people who implanted in the history the representative and democratic Government. Your example inspired the great men who, with their heroic efforts, built our countries. The cause of justice always found vigorous voices among you, and in the unwithering memory of our gratitude the voice of Henry Clay still resounds pleading for the recognition of our American Republics.

No waning and no detriment shall the noble principles suffer that have an altar in this House which is the heart of a great Nation. And that is why we come confident, unperturbed by the disparity of our respective powers. We long to live in a world ruled by justice and law, where we can offer reciprocal help, reciprocal respect, and reciprocal trust. Under the beneficent protection of those principles, which are the very shelter of the magnificent tree of American solidarity, comes to you today, firm and loyal, the ratification of Venezuela's fraternal friendship. We do not want to be deceived, nor do we want to deceive. In full good faith we serve the cause of democracy and justice which we know is also your cause. We have no concealed intentions. Neither in the past nor in the present have we ever traded with our ideals, and we can state that our adherence and our friendship bear not the slightest shade of a mean interest. We have never asked for anything; we have never accepted anything which we have not fully paid for, and our friendship, on the contrary, brings a considerable material help to the cause for which your own children are offering their lives.

That is why the foundations upon which we approach you are solid and the friendly hand that we stretch out to you is firm.

No wonder that, friends of the past, we are friends of today, for the identity of the ideals that we shared in the past still exist in the present, and the only debts pending between our two countries are those that spring from chivalry, noble deeds, and the fair intentions of our international deals. Our attitude today is the same it ever was. Consequently, from the very moment of the criminal attack on Pearl Harbor, we were at your side. The cause you fight for is the common cause of all democratic peoples. In addition to the powers beyond the seas, the republics of this hemisphere are with you, because of their convictions, because of their own interests, because of the defense of their traditions and their future liberty, and in this way they keep their word, given out of their own free will, at a time when nobody knew against whom the first continental aggression would be directed. If Venezuela took your part without hesitation, it certainly was not to offer only the very valuable moral support of an independent people, but also to contribute in an effective way to the collective war effort and to share with you the sufferings and difficulties that, in a greater or lesser degree, necessarily were to be our lot. We have given, and are now giving to you, all we can. Our available raw materials and articles of primary importance are at the command of the United Nations. Our oil, luckily abundant, has reached and will continue to reach the battlefields on the side of the democracies. In addition to our material help, we cooperate with you in the study and coordinated fulfillment of many other common purposes and problems, and our contribution during the recovery period, when the war is over, will be as large and effective as our means may allow, because we realize that in it goes liberty for all, future security, and survival and development of that free life which was the dream of the glorious founders of our nations. My Government has studied with great interest everything that has a bearing on our participation in the common cause, and we are convinced that our attitude and position of today freely permits us to give all that our country's energies are capable of giving.

From Simon Bolivar we inherited the consciousness of American unity, strengthened by the immutable geographic reality and by our common interests and ideals. The present emergency is bringing us even closer together, and you may be sure that it is the whole people of my country who, through me, say to you now: Venezuela is with you today, tomorrow, and always, for the sake of justice, for the sake of democracy, for the sake of man's happiness.

Following his address, the President of Venezuela and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. RUSSELL in the chair].

EXPENDITURES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, we have just been honored with a personal visit and message from the distinguished President of Venezuela, General Medina. General Medina is the second President from among our good neighbors to the south who has visited and spoken to us since my return last September from a trip through Latin America. It is indeed a great privilege and an honor to receive these distinguished visitors, and it is my hope that we may in time have heard in person from the President of each of the 20 Latin-American countries.

I first met our distinguished visitor, General Medina, on his arrival at the airport in La Paz, where hundreds of prominent persons had gathered to greet him as a welcome visitor to Bolivia. I was deeply impressed with the pomp and ceremony of the occasion, the booming of the official salute, the roar of American planes flown by native pilots. I was impressed with the genuine sincerity apparent in everything.

At La Paz, President Medina was completing his official visits to the neighboring governments in South America, as an example of genuine friendship and good neighborliness. In the same spirit he is our guest today. I, for one, not only welcome him, but I hope his reception in the United States will be as genuinely friendly as was his reception when he visited his close neighbors in South America. I believe it will be.

Venezuela is making a great contribution to our war effort. Last year it averaged an output of about 500,000 barrels of oil a day. When I was there in early September, I learned it was planned to boost the output to an even million barrels a day.

In my further remarks at this time, made in reply to those who have criticized me for my report on Latin American affairs, I ask that Senators realize that my personal attitude toward every Latin American country is as genuinely friendly as the feeling I have indicated toward Venezuela. I want us to merit their friendship and cooperation, and I hope that we merit the same from each of them.

As further evidence of my sincere desire to be a genuine friend of our Latin American neighbors, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the February issue of the Reader's Digest be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY ARE STILL DEEP, DARK SECRETS

(By HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from Nebraska)

(An advance copy of the article by Senator BUTLER which appeared in the December Reader's Digest was submitted to Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. He was invited to defend the practices of the good-neighbor policy, as pointed out by Senator BUTLER.)

Unforeseen circumstances prevented Mr. Rockefeller from completing his article for the January issue, as planned. Later, Mr. Rockefeller requested that his article be withheld from publication in deference to the

statement released to the newspapers by Mr. Cordell Hull, eloquently supporting the good-neighbor policy.

Like Mr. Hull, the Reader's Digest believes in that policy. The point at issue, however, is whether the huge nonwar outlays by the United States in Central and South America are now promoting hemispheric solidarity and good will.—The Editors.)

In the United States the principle of the good-neighbor policy for the increase of good will and cooperation between ourselves and Latin America is above partisanship and beyond debate. Both Republicans and Democrats give it enthusiastic support.

But the fact that we endorse the good-neighbor principle does not mean that we must give blank-check endorsement to all the methods that have been used in seeking to carry it out.

In an article in the December issue of the Reader's Digest, after recounting evidence of United States bungling, boondoggling, and extravagance in Latin America, I wrote: "The answer to all this is not to scrap the good-neighbor policy. The answer is to make it authentically good neighbor." Despite this explicit statement, spokesmen for our present methods have sought to make it appear that these exposures are an attempt to injure the good-neighbor policy. The issue, I repeat, is not the good-neighbor policy; it is the vast welter of dubious, unnecessary, and wasteful projects which, under cover of that policy, we have undertaken—undertaken very largely without the knowledge of the American people.

I repeat that the soundest friends of the good-neighbor policy are those who insist that we should bring those projects into the open for public appraisal.

The need for such appraisal is not merely my personal opinion. It is important to remember that my conclusions reflect the composite judgment of a score of experienced, on-the-job United States diplomats with whom I talked, veteran representatives of United States agencies long established in Latin America, as well as independent journalists and businessmen.

Recently a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives went to Latin America. Chairman of that subcommittee was MATTHEW J. MERRITT, a Democrat. Three of its five members were Democrats. Their chief purpose was to inspect our military bases in Latin America. But when they returned, early in December, they issued a statement to which every Member, Democrat as well as Republican, subscribed.

After recognizing the unchallenged benefits of the good-neighbor policy this statement warned us that "the expenditures of huge funds by the Americans is an everyday occurrence which no longer has a salutary effect."

A not inconsiderable part of this expenditure, the statement made clear, is unnecessary and harmful. In particular, our inexcusably high wage scales are upsetting the local economies and creating ill will. "In every instance known to the committee," the report declares, "these wage scales are much higher than the native wages. Since there was little competing employment in any of these areas, the additional incentive was not required to obtain workers. As a result of these higher wage scales, misunderstanding and resentment have been created among the local people and unrest and jealousies among the workers."

Bungling and waste—much of it due to the many United States agencies vying with each other for a place in the spending sun—are apparent. "It is necessary," says this nonpartisan statement, "to report criticism of Federal agencies which, in nearly every country, appear to get under each other's feet in the scramble to advance their respective

interests. There is great need for coordination of effort and singleness of purpose."

For this extravagant meddling, the report states, the United States suffers: "Bungling tactics by amateur good-will emissaries who bid against each other have created confusion and injured American standing."

This confirmation of what I saw and the testimony I secured in Latin America are underscored by the reports of Washington correspondents who, under the sponsorship of the United States Government, went to Brazil late last fall to inspect our efforts to get rubber out of the Amazon jungle. Our critical war need for rubber may serve as an excuse for the fact that, in its early stages, this project, as the correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune described it, resembled "a gigantic international boondoggle." Today, according to his report, "it has been whittled down to something like an export edition of W. P. A."

Marquis W. Childs, highly reputable Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, wrote that straight from our American diplomats "comes a plain intimation that there are far too many Americans duplicating each other's work and spreading confusion."

"The Brazilian people," he continued, "are polite but they do not conceal the doubts they feel about the presence of so many Americans in their country. They refer to the coming of the North Americans as 'an invasion of friendly paratroopers' and they put an ironic inflection on the word 'friendly.' Here in Rio alone are several thousand American civilians connected with the United States Purchasing Commission, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and several other agencies."

No observer can miss this costly, confusing overlapping among United States agencies and the ill effects upon our relationships with Latin America.

A responsible United States official, long identified with Latin American affairs, reported on his recent return that in one city he found seven separate American agencies engaged in what should have been the one-agency business of United States purchasing. He said: "They were all in competition—conflict would be a better word for it—with each other. The consequences were equally bad for the United States pocketbook and the United States reputation."

An American official who has had close-up opportunity to observe our recent spending policies asked me to quote, verbatim, this conclusion he has reached: "Throwing money around the way we do is bad for the people and they resent it. Because we need to buy certain materials in this country is no excuse, as the people see it, for our attempting to come in and operate enterprises for them. They hotly resent the idea that they can't do their operating themselves. The government of this country, and its people, are exceedingly jealous for the maintenance of their national sovereignty. They are highly suspicious of what we may do to it."

The distinguished foreign minister of a country notable for its friendliness to the United States summed it up when he said that United States spending, lending, and giving in some Latin American nations actually exceeds the average per capita income of the people of those countries and that the nonessential expenditures can be eliminated without harm to hemisphericism.

Federal bookkeeping being what it is, only a congressional inquiry, with power to subpoena the records and accounts of dozens of agencies and to examine witnesses under oath, can possibly discover the full total of what we are spending in Latin America. My own further investigation will confirm the assertions made in my article in the December Reader's Digest. This investigation is

continuing under the direction of qualified accountants. Its results will be published.

The final figure for nonwar expenditures, whatever it precisely is, will be an alarming sum to anyone who financial senses are not already benumbed. That we are benumbed may explain why we overlook the fact that the United States alone, among all the governments of the world, has the effrontery to spend money lavishly for the making over of other nations.

Since calling attention to what is happening in Latin America, I have received more than 3,000 letters, of which 90 percent approve my article and report. But more significantly, these letters included several scores from persons with first-hand knowledge of Latin American affairs. More than 93 percent of these people confirm, out of their experience, my findings. The following typical quotations are exclusively from persons with such first-hand knowledge:

"Our neighbors to the south are proud and they resent our charity and our patronizing attitude."

"The reason we are looked upon as 'simple' is because we urge loans and gifts without exacting a quid pro quo. They can understand a bargain, give and take, and respect a bargainer such as England, but they wonder where the joker is with us."

"I agree with you on every point. Throughout South America you'll find all sorts of United States commissions, accomplishing absolutely nothing but throwing away United States money."

"I can confirm what you said about the stupidity of upsetting the whole economic set-up in these countries by paying native labor needlessly excessive wages."

"The Latins are not going to think any more of us for spending money. If they like us, they will like us for our qualities, not our dollars. We cannot buy friendship with money."

"Stay with your investigation in the hope that we can live down being the laughing-stock of South Americans. Fifty percent of our army of inexperienced culture boys in South America should be weeded out now."

"I congratulate you on your courageous exposé of our current dollar diplomacy in Central and South America. Your outline of its potential future repercussions is quite inadequate."

"Our wild spending spree in Latin America will not only result in their thinking us utter damn fools, but it is certain to cause a world of financial difficulties in those countries."

"If the rest of Latin America is like Mexico your report is a bull's-eye."

"There can be no real feeling of friendliness and understanding based on the mania of the planners who think that money is a universal panacea. I am a Latin American from Costa Rica. I have tried to demonstrate by all possible means to my friends in the United States the harm your country is doing in Latin America by flooding it with money, money, money."

"Countries down there do not want to be patronized as though they were orphans or indigents. They ask for recognition as equals. They look upon our insane spending spree during the past few years as a visit from Santa Claus and they take the presents from the Christmas tree avidly but without gratitude. You are entirely right; you cannot buy Latin American friendship."

"The minute the war is over, Latin American countries are going to throw our 'do-gooder' crowd and philanthropic myopics out by the nape of the neck, and resume business with Europeans who do business down there on a hard-boiled basis, withal in a manner consistent with the customs of the people. Just as after the last war—only to a much greater degree—we shall find that we have lost ground in our trade with Latin America."

I trust that the Senate investigation of the quixotic spending spree in Latin America will be complete and without quarter.

"I agree with you that the ultimate outcome of all this reckless spending will do much to destroy the good-neighbor policy.

"Underneath the Latin American's extremely polite exterior he has always seemed to me the complete realist always looking for the 'gato encerrado'—the hidden cat—in any proposal to give him something for nothing. The result is that we lose his respect. And mutual respect seems to me the fundamental of all sound international relationships. The Latin Americans resent our condescension, just as we resented it on the part of Europeans toward ourselves in an earlier day. Our policy has been completely unrealistic and the administration of it intentionally staffed with people who know nothing about actual conditions, but were chosen because they are willing to carry out the policy and ask no questions."

The good-neighbor policy, I reiterate, is not on trial. What well-informed persons are criticizing is the means by which that policy is being practiced. There is no justification whatever for shrouding in secrecy thousands of United States projects in Latin America. Unless the truth about these practices is fully known and squarely faced, the policy itself cannot continue to merit the confidence, either here or in Latin America, which rightfully should belong to it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall not read the entire article at this time, but I should like to read two or three paragraphs from it. The first paragraph of the article is as follows:

In the United States the principle of the good-neighbor policy for the increase of good will and cooperation between ourselves and Latin America is above partisanship and beyond debate. Both Republicans and Democrats give it enthusiastic support.

But the fact that we endorse the good-neighbor principle does not mean that we must give blank-check endorsement to all the methods that have been used in seeking to carry it out.

I now read a paragraph appearing in the center of the article:

The distinguished foreign minister of a country notable for its friendliness to the United States summed it up when he said that United States spending, lending, and giving in some Latin American nations actually exceed the average per capita income of the people of those countries and that "the nonessential expenditures can be eliminated without harm to hemispherism."

Mr. President, the closing paragraph of the article reads as follows:

The good-neighbor policy, I reiterate, is not on trial. What well-informed persons are criticizing is the means by which that policy is being practiced. There is no justification whatever for shrouding in secrecy thousands of United States projects in Latin America. Unless the truth about these practices is fully known and squarely faced, the policy itself cannot continue to merit the confidence, either here or in Latin America, which rightfully should belong to it.

Mr. President, on November 26, I made a report to the Senate on our financial operations in Latin America. In that report I said—and I quote:

Our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit in or for Latin America during the 3 years, 1942, 1943, and 1944 total more than \$6,000,000,000.

Mr. President, the document I hold in my hand is an item-by-item list of our

expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit relating to Latin America during those 3 years. Every item in this list has been documented. Every item has been documented as to its source. The source is set forth in these tables. Every item has been documented as to amount. The amount is set forth in these tables.

More than that, Mr. President, the documentation of every item and of every amount has been certified and authenticated by the well-known Washington accounting firm of James A. Councilor & Co. The head of that firm, Mr. Councilor, was formerly president of the American Society of Certified Public Accountants. The investigation and certification were under the immediate direction of Mr. M. T. Charlton of that firm. Mr. Charlton is at present the president of the District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

Mr. President, this documented, certified total of our expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit relating to Latin America during the 3 years 1942, 1943, and 1944, amounts to \$5,733,953,534.

It was said on the floor of the Senate that my figures were 95 percent wrong and 5 percent right. They were attacked as false, not only here, but by administration spokesmen in the departments. Mr. President, in the light of this certificate of the public accountant, I submit that those administration statements are proof of the administration's duplicity in perverting the good-neighbor policy so as to spread the New Deal and its methods to envelop a hemisphere. On the basis solely of this first, documented, certified list, which I have just exhibited, I am 95.5 percent right. As a businessman, accustomed to business methods in bookkeeping, I submit that, in the dark and labyrinthine maze of the Government's accounting, 95.5 percent right is as near correct as any mortal has any right to expect to be.

But, Mr. President, I was not wrong. The figures in this total are not all the figures which I would present if I had ready access to all the administration's records, and the energetic aid of the New Deal's accountants. But, even with that handicap, the total figure which, before I am through, I will present today will be substantially in excess of the \$6,000,000,000 contained as the total in my first report. This report will interest every Member of this body who wants to know where the taxpayer's money goes, what it goes for, and what it accomplishes when it gets there. Moreover, this document will bear examination by every Member of this body who believes, as I do, in the good-neighbor policy, and not a good-neighbor New Deal. To a discussion of the items in this certified total of \$5,733,953,534 of our "expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit" to Latin America, I will return a little later.

Here, Mr. President, is another document. This is a list of our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit during 1942, 1943, and 1944, in and to our Latin American possessions—the Panama Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. Every item

in this list has been documented. Its documentation has been certified by the firm of Councilor & Co. The total amount thus documented and certified is \$662,806,970.

That sum, Mr. President, is not part of the \$5,733,953,534 documented and certified in the previous list. I am not including this in that total. This is a different three-quarters of a billion dollars altogether.

But let no one assume that this sum of \$662,806,970, separated though it is in the total, can be separated from any honest, over-all account of what we are doing in Latin America. These are our possessions. We have responsibility for them in peace. We have greater responsibility for them in war. We will spend what is necessary to meet those responsibilities. All that is true.

But the place where this sum has gone, is going, and will go is not somewhere else. The place is Latin America. The amount we spend in these Latin American possessions has some effect on adjoining areas. The way we spend it has a great deal of effect. If we are lavish and wasteful in the Territories under our flag, the consequences of our lavishness and wastefulness cannot be confined to those Territories. They set precedents; they stir unrest; they create ill-will elsewhere.

Moreover, Mr. President—and this is the most important point—it is in these possessions of ours, particularly in the Virgin Islands under Mr. Harold Ickes and in Puerto Rico under Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell that the pattern of New Deal spending for all Latin America has been set and fashioned.

Let us suppose, Mr. President, that I am an inquiring and somewhat skeptical Latin American. As such I want to know what the United States, if given a wholly free hand, would do down there. Where would I go? I would not go to Washington. I would go, rather, to those areas of Latin America where we already have a free hand.

What would I find? Would I find in Dr. Tugwell's Puerto Rico evidence to encourage me to believe in New Deal neighborism? On the contrary, I would find much to alarm me. A distinguished Member of this body, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], went to Puerto Rico last year. What did he find? He found a place where—and I quote him—"there is only one commodity of which there is an abundance and that is Government employees." I would find, if I were an inquiring Latin American, that last spring 30 percent of the island's employables were unemployed. I would find a territory which, more nearly than any other in the New World's history, is governed according to the principles of state socialism.

No intelligent Latin American could witness what we are doing and come away without having his faith in our good-neighbor policy badly shaken. For he would see in our New Deal spending in our own possessions a blueprint of the New Deal's Latin American shape of things to come.

I am offering this document for the RECORD. It belongs there because in this

three-quarters of a billion dollars—more, perhaps, than anywhere else—is concealed the answer to the question: What is the New Deal, under the good-neighbor cloak, aiming for in Latin America?

The first document which I introduced was a certified total of our expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit to Latin America during 1942, 1943, and 1944. The total thus certified was \$5,733,953,534.

Let no one assume that that grand total of \$6,396,760,504 to Latin America and to our Latin American possessions is all that we have expended, committed, and extended down there. That total of \$6,396,760,504 is only the documented, certified total. That is the amount that we can be absolutely sure of. That is the amount which this responsible, highly reputable firm of accountants would certify and authenticate.

How much more there is no one can say. How much more there is no single Member of this body, however aided by experts, can find out. The sums of money for which no public accounting is made are too vast. The technique of concealment is too well developed. The dark art of financial double-talk has been too well mastered. We do not know. Perhaps the administration does not know. Certainly, the taxpayer does not know.

But there is evidence of much additional, unrevealed expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit. There is substantial evidence of it. There is substantial evidence that the sum, if it were known, would be a huge one.

Let me illustrate what I mean. On November 18, 1942, our American Ambassador to Mexico signed an agreement with the Mexican Government for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Mexico's government-owned railroads from Laredo, Tex., all the way to Guatemala. According to that agreement, the United States bears the cost of all materials and equipments. It bears the cost of all rails and fastenings. It furnishes, without cost to Mexico, all the technicians necessary for the job. It bears the cost of repairing railway locomotives. It bears the cost of whatever additional Mexican road gangs are necessary for the labor. In short, Mr. President, the United States foots the bill.

How much that bill will be nobody knows. You will notice that I have put down, in the first document of certified expenditures, a total of \$7,500,000 for this project. That is the amount which the Government will acknowledge. But nobody believes or contends that that is anything like the total eventual cost. On the contrary, Mr. President, I have had testimony from two competent sources that the total cost will be near \$100,000,000. One of these authorities is Mr. Floyd Ransome, a Mexico City American businessman now associated with the Office of Economic Warfare and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The other is William F. Machold, head of the Trade and Commerce Division of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Both of these competent

witnesses have declared that the cost of this railway undertaking will be close to \$100,000,000.

That is \$92,500,000 more than is included in our certified total. But, Mr. President, no honest, over-all account of our Latin-American expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit would be honest or over-all that left that sum out of account. One may ask how this administration could appropriate that sum without Congress knowing about it. But if he does, let him ask also where the \$7,500,000 appears in the Budget.

That is just one item of this type of expenditure. Throughout Latin America funds are going into cinchona plantations, sansiviera plantations, cryptostegia plantations, hennequin plantations, sisal plantations, abaca plantations, Rotenone plantations. They are expensive. They are costing us multiplied millions of dollars. But how many? Eighty millions? One hundred millions? I have been unable, despite persistent and lengthy effort, to find an exact figure. The items will not be found in the Budget; and even if some administration spokesmen should declare blandly that the sum is so many millions, why should their statements merit credulity when these same spokesmen's figures do not jibe with what the certified public accountants find?

Another item unknown in amount, but surely known as a fact, is the Mexican oil-refinery project known as Petroleas Mexicanos. This was mentioned in a press release from the Coordinator's office; and newspapermen, quoting the Coordinator, as they often do, though he may have spoken only orally of the project, mentioned in their stories the sum of \$10,000,000. What is the correct amount? Why does not the New Deal state it, rather than saying, as its spokesmen did on this floor some weeks ago, that the funds simply had not been paid out as yet. There was no denial, however, that the money was not obligated. They are undocumented figures, it is true; but important.

Then there are administrative expenses. In the certified public accountants' list is a \$23,000,000 item covering the pay roll for only 16 of the agencies which are doing business in Latin America. But there is evidence that there are 40 other Government agencies running up expenses there. What are their administrative expenditures? Another \$23,000,000? Maybe more? I cannot supply the figures because they have not been made available to me. Yet such figures would add to the total of our Latin American expenditures.

A Mr. Cook, an official of Standard Oil at Buenos Aires, told me that the United States Government had financed \$50,000,000 worth of oil exploration in Argentina. Is this a fact? I wrote the Petroleum Administrator for War in an attempt to ascertain just how much Government money was being used to finance oil explorations through Latin America. I received no reply. I lack the authority to send an auditor either to P. A. W. or to the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. But the information their books contain

certainly should be interesting in any over-all picture of our Latin American operations.

Throughout Latin America our military authorities have built radio stations and otherwise improved the continent's communications. Those numerous towers and installations cost some millions of dollars, according to what was told me while looking at them in the company of high military and naval officers. But the immense amount of expenditure involved in their construction is unknown; the Washington officials say the amount is a military secret and therefore not available to me, a United States Senator.

In that same category are pay rolls of military and naval personnel stationed in Latin America. This money, spent largely in Latin America, would be enough to cause a great part of the inflationary conditions existing in many Latin American countries today. To the extent that these sums helped to carry the Latin American economy, they certainly made unnecessary those welfare type and boondoggling expenditures which we have spread through the countries. But what is the amount? It has been variously estimated as high as \$400,000,000, but it is not included on the certified list I began with today because it is not definitely known.

Let me repeat, the foregoing are not a part of the \$5,733,953,534, which is the authenticated, certified total of our expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit in Latin America. This is not a part of the \$662,806,970, which is the authenticated total of our expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit in and to our Latin American possessions. This is additional.

I am submitting these figures for the Record. I am offering them for the Record because no honest, over-all account of our operations in Latin America would be either over-all or honest if it failed to indicate that beyond our certified total of \$5,733,953,534 in Latin America, and in addition to our certified total of \$662,806,970 in our Latin American possessions, there are other sums, amounts unknown, which must be taken into consideration.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I do not rest the case on this uncertified spending. I do not even rest the case on the \$662,806,970 of certified spending in our Latin American possessions.

I rest the case on the certified amounts contained in the first document which I introduced. That document shows that "our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit" to Latin America in the years 1942, 1943, and 1944 were \$5,733,953,534.

That, Mr. President, is not \$6,000,000,000. That is \$266,046,466 less than \$6,000,000,000. My assertion to this body on November 26 has thus been proved to be 4.5 percent wrong. I rest the case on the fact that that assertion has been proved to be 95.5 percent right.

I hope that this document will be examined. I hope it will be examined for errors. In my original statement to the

Senate I said "It would be miraculous if all errors were avoided in making such a long and detailed report." That is still true.

Perhaps my own further investigations will prove that instead of being 95.5 percent right, I am 125 percent right. That is altogether possible. Every day, working through the New Deal's Latin American maze, I come upon new documentation which makes it possible to transfer an uncertified item into the certified list.

But meanwhile, 95.5 percent right is right enough for me. It will be right enough for the American taxpayer. To the American taxpayer, and to me, \$5,733,953,534 is a lot of money. Approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars is a lot of money.

Mr. President, does this add up to \$6,000,000,000? Or does it not? To me, to the American taxpayers, to any fair-minded Member of this body, it adds up to a great deal more than \$6,000,000,000.

The important fact about that figure is not that my original assertion has thus been substantiated. I am not chiefly interested in my own vindication. Neither are the bases of my arguments statistical. This multi-billion-dollar total, Mr. President, is important because it demonstrates, in Latin America, what the present Government of the United States apparently aims to do all over the world. In Latin America we have already found out what we are beginning to find out in other parts of the world, namely, that money will not buy good will and that the Treasury of the United States cannot successfully be the agent for building our post-war world.

Recently an Associated Press dispatch from north Africa came to my attention. That dispatch from this objective news source outlined in detail the story of the way in which, in north Africa, we are throwing our money around. It indicates, just as the facts in Latin America indicate, that the consequences of our spending are not good consequences. Instead of liking us better, the people in north Africa are liking us less; instead of having a greater desire for our way of life, they are turning hostile to that way of life.

That, Mr. President, is what is happening in Latin America. It is time for us to recognize that fact and face it. It is time that we understood that our Latin American ventures are only one part of a world venture. It is time that we called a halt and took an inventory. That is what I am asking for. I am asking for it because such an inventory is the first step necessary in the direction of developing a policy that will be soundly good neighbor.

But having set the figures straight, I should like to set straight a few other things. It would be greatly to the liking of those behind the good-neighbor New Deal if they could shift the ground of this debate entirely. Even the new dealers do not like the sound of \$6,000,000,000—not when it is made public. They would like to have us talk about our Latin American ventures exclusively in terms of expenditures, that is, cash on the barrel head, paid out. If we should do

that they would come up with considerably less than \$6,000,000,000 and they would be a lot happier about it. But we will not be caught in that trap. I aim to give to the people of this country and to the people of Latin America, not the New Deal picture of what we have undertaken, but an honest picture of what we have undertaken. Any over-all accounting which stops with expenditures, which does not include commitment and extensions of credit is thoroughly misleading, deceptive, and dishonest.

I am not going into the legal technicalities as to whether an obligation is an actual expenditure or when it becomes one; or whether a commitment is an actual expenditure; or whether an extension of credit is an actual expenditure. Such technicalities are red herrings.

But, Mr. President, I am going to point out that it has been my observation and experience as, I am sure, it has been the experience of other Members of this body, that sooner or later a commitment does become an expenditure; sooner or later an extension of credit does become an expenditure. If an expenditure were not in mind then, plainly, the commitment or the extension of credit would not have been asked for in the first place. Such commitments and credits were asked for from the Treasury of the United States, because somebody in our Latin American operations had something specifically in mind for which that money was going to be used. Perhaps it was not all to be used in this year. Perhaps the project in mind extended over 2 years, 5 years, or 10 years, with payments out of the United States Treasury continuing year by year through that period. But it is obvious that to know what we are up to in Latin America we must take not merely 1 year's installment on our obligations. We must take the total obligation.

In my report to the Senate last November, I said "our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit." That is what I meant to say. I repeat, today, that "our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit" to Latin America during the 3 years 1942, 1943, and 1944 total \$5,733,953,534. Any other kind of accounting would have as its only aim and purpose the deceiving of the American people.

Now, it would also be greatly to the liking of those behind the good-neighbor New Deal if they could shift the ground of this debate in another direction. They would like to have us omit entirely from our reckoning what has been, is being, and will be spent in Latin America for war purposes, for the securing of war materials, for the development of air and naval bases. If I did that, I could come up with a lot less than \$6,000,000,000. But if I did that I would also be dishonest. An over-all accounting of what we are doing in Latin America and of the consequences of our doing it which leaves military and naval expenditures out of account is misleading and deceptive.

Let me take a moment here to point out one of the divers and sundry tricks by which the New Deal sought to dis-

credit my report. Alarmed that somebody, at long last, had begun to pry the lid off, the new dealers raised the hue and cry that I had classified our war expenditures in Latin America as boondoggling. Even the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was taken in by that. He said:

The Senator has made an astounding statement that \$6,000,000,000 has been spent in boondoggling in South and Central America.

I know how, in the heat of debate, such unsupported and unsupportable charges are sometimes made. I do not criticize the Senator from Tennessee for having made, in the heat of the moment, such an unsupported and unsupportable charge against me. He knows, of course, that I did not say that; that I did not say anything like that. I am sure he will recall that I said:

In the list there are many items in connection with the purchase of critical materials which I would not criticize.

I did not criticize them then. I do not criticize them now. Moreover, I do not criticize the necessary spending involved in the building of air and naval bases which are indispensable for Latin America's defense and for our common victory.

May I digress for a moment, Mr. President, to underline that remark "indispensable for Latin America's defense and for our common victory." I am acutely conscious of the size and importance of Latin America's contribution to our war effort. But, Mr. President, this is not our war effort alone. It is also their war effort. They are not providing us with these necessary things entirely out of the kindness of their hearts. In the first place we pay handsomely for them. In the second place we are using them for the protection of these nations themselves.

Or is it true, Mr. President, as some of the administration's spokesmen would lead us to believe, that democracy is on such shaky foundations in Latin America that it must be shored up with our money? Is it true, as one inevitably gathers from administration arguments, that, though the nations of Latin America are in this war formally, their hearts are not in it and that we, therefore, are obliged to pour in the money lest, not liking the company they are in, they pull out again?

I do not believe that these things are true. But that is what the administration, searching for reasons for its vast expenditures, would lead us to think. But if, by any chance, the administration is right; if these things are true; if the support in Latin America for us and for our war effort will only last as long as the money holds out, then, Mr. President, the sooner we find it out the better.

But what I am getting at, Mr. President, is the total story of United States financial operations in Latin America and the consequences thereof. Anybody who thinks that that story would be complete without an accounting of our war expenditures and commitments,

however necessary, is deliberately leaving out of account one of the most important chapters in that story. Moreover, Mr. President, it is time we took serious note of the New Deal's latest strategy of defense and coercion. That strategy is to hide the New Deal, its plans and purposes, its extravagances and waste, under the cloak of war necessity. That is a clever maneuver. For then when anyone in Congress or elsewhere arises to attack the New Deal's plans and purposes, its extravagance and waste, that person is forthwith assailed as hindering the war effort. Mr. President, the war effort and the New Deal are not synonymous. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that we would have more war effort if we had less New Deal.

I do not propose to fall into that trap either. The New Deal's operations in Latin America have made use of military necessity for ideological purposes. The New Deal's authority in the matter of our military expenditures in Latin America has resulted in extravagance and waste.

I am by no means alone in that conclusion, Mr. President. Last fall a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives went to Latin America. The chairman of this committee was MATTHEW J. MERRITT. Mr. MERRITT is a Democrat. Three of the five members of this subcommittee were Democrats. On their return, only last month, they issued a statement. It was a unanimous statement, the three Democrats concurring with the two Republicans.

What they had to say concerned military construction and the payment of wages on these admittedly necessary military projects. Here is what they said:

In every instance known to the committee, these wage scales are much higher than native wages. Since there was little competing employment in these areas, the additional incentive was not required to obtain workers. But as a result of these higher wages misunderstanding and resentment have been created among the local people and unrest and jealousies among the workers. The War Department is continuing to pay its native workers more than the prevailing wages at practically every base investigated.

In the current February issue of the Reader's Digest I have written a second article, the title of which is "They Are Still Deep, Dark Secrets." I have already referred to that article, and included it as a part of my remarks. That article contains further, competent testimony, such as that given by the Merritt committee, from persons intimately familiar with what we are doing in Latin America.

The new dealers, Mr. President, would like to have me leave such evidence as that out of my accounting. They would like to have me omit the extravagance and waste which behind the excuse of war necessity they are forcing upon our military leaders. But I do not propose to leave that out of my account. What I am presenting here is not a New Deal

apologetic. What I am presenting is an honest accounting.

Moreover, Mr. President, our war expending and commitments and extensions of credit to Latin America, however necessary, have put many of these countries on the crest of an economic boom. It is a boom, I might add, which has worked chiefly to the advantage of those who are in the upper financial brackets. Very little of it has been transmitted, as yet, to the advantage of the average man and woman, unless perchance, he happens to be a United States employee. The average man and woman are quite differently affected. They are not the beneficiaries of our spending. They are, rather, the victims of the inflationary situation which our spending has produced.

This is not my opinion alone. The American in Mexico who probably knows more than any other about the economic consequences of our operations there is Mr. Floyd Ransome. Mr. Ransome is a businessman, one of the most successful American businessmen in Mexico. As a war service, he was serving, when I saw him, in a representative capacity for both the Office of Economic Warfare and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He was frankly alarmed at the inflationary pressures which were resulting from excessive United States spending in Mexico. In his opinion, the rank and file Mexicans do not benefit. Rather, they have ground for resentment.

Last fall, a dozen outstanding United States correspondents were taken on an officially sponsored trip to view our efforts to get raw rubber from the Amazon jungle. They saw many things in addition. Among other things, they saw the same inflationary consequences of our large-scale spending. One of them, Marquis W. Childs, distinguished Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, wrote as follows:

While appraisal is difficult in a country with such close internal censorship as Brazil, some observers believe they see signs of gathering unrest.

In spite of handsome charts which show the contrary, prices have risen and life for the ordinary citizen is more difficult.

I should like to say that in the current issue of Reader's Digest, to which I have already referred, there will be found more authentic confirmation of this independent testimony.

Naturally, Mr. President, the new dealers would like to have me leave those consequences out of the picture. They would like to have me omit any reference to the expenditures which are helping to produce those consequences. That I do not propose to be tricked into doing.

Toward the end of December there was a revolution in Bolivia, a revolution which threw out a pro-United States government and brought to power a government more pro-Axis. Was this because we had not spent enough money in Bolivia to buy her good will? Or was it because so little of the huge sums we spent reached the common people? Or was it simply because good will is some-

thing which cannot be bought over the counter and rung up on a cash register?

I want to read two responsible statements about Bolivia which may help to answer these questions. Last August Harper's magazine carried an article by that well-known authority on Latin America, Mr. Carleton Beals. The article was entitled "Inside the Good Neighbor Policy." It concerned the good-neighbor policy, as currently practiced, in Bolivia. It made it plain that, inside the currently practiced good-neighbor policy in Bolivia, there are a good many things that neither look nice nor smell nice.

But let me quote Mr. Beals' conclusions. He says:

Thus in the United States urgency to obtain such essential war materials or to prevent them from reaching the enemy there is no assurance necessarily that the good-neighbor policy will be permanently fortified or that the future economic independence and prosperity of Bolivia or the full development of its potential resources in guarantee of permanent economic security will be attained. Certainly there is in all this no assurance of any satisfactory post-war solution.

The Bolivian tangle—

And I am still quoting Mr. Beals—

presents other aspects of far-reaching importance. The immediate problem in Bolivia has been to change the formula "tin versus human welfare" into "human welfare plus more tin." But if we write extensive labor provisions into our contracts for foreign materials, is there any way of seeing that they are lived up to except by utilizing American Government inspectors? Any such move promptly runs afoul of national sovereignties. Are we, in addition to military, economic, diplomatic, and other missions of experts, to put social-welfare commissions to promote labor legislation in every land on the face of the earth? How long can we support such world-wide welfare undertakings?

And what—

Mr. Beals asks—

if the Bolivian economy collapses with the end of our buying spurge? There was a boom during the last war, after that Bolivia wallowed in the trough of hard times until the onset of the present war. The benefits of these booms accrue mostly to the absentees, the country and most of its people scabble along in their bleak and remote poverty, the prey of politicians at home and landlords abroad.

What is going to happen—

And this is still Mr. Beals—

to the recommendations of our high-minded mission? What is going to be the fate of the good-neighbor policy? What can that policy accomplish that will leave the Bolivians less driven, less at the mercy of the powers that now dominate them?

That, Mr. President, is the testimony of Mr. Carleton Beals. Of course, the new dealers would like to have me leave all that out of our accounting.

Here is further testimony to the same effect. In its issue of January 3 Time magazine reported, in some detail, the Bolivian revolution which happened a few days earlier. Time concluded the report with these significant comments:

The United States buys Bolivian tin, helps her with loans, technicians, lend-lease. But

these favors do not touch the heart of the Bolivian people. When they stoned the United States Embassy they were criticizing United States policy in the only way they knew.

Naturally, Mr. President, the New Deal hopes I will skip that. They hope that I will leave part of our Latin American operations out of account so that they can escape responsibility for the consequences of our expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit to Latin America. I aim to present, not part of the picture, but the whole picture. Unless we see and understand the whole picture, we shall never be in a position to take those steps necessary to forestall further consequences of this unhappy sort.

Moreover, there is another fact which such an honest accounting must consider. There is boondoggling in our operations in Latin America. There is a vast amount of it. Just how much there is, just what its actual dollars-and-cents size may be, no one can say. There is boondoggling in enterprises which the New Deal has sought to cover up under the cloak of war necessity.

On the face of it the getting of rubber out of the Amazon jungle is not a boondoggle. The New Deal hopes that we will assume that that project is a war project, and not scrutinize it too closely, but it has been scrutinized. The newspapermen who went down there last fall had a good look at it.

Let me read to the Senate what one of them said about it. This is from Frank Kelley, experienced and able member of the Washington Bureau of the New York Herald Tribune. He sent this cable from Brazil. He said:

The rubber program in the Amazon began a year and a half ago as a gigantic international boondoggle. Today it has been whittled down to something like an export edition of W. P. A.

That is not my opinion, Mr. President. That is the opinion of a responsible newspaperman who was seeing firsthand. Here is the way in which the New York Herald Tribune, commenting on Mr. Kelley's dispatch, summed it up. Calling the project, as undertaken by the Board of Economic Warfare, an attempt to create "an impossible brave new world in the jungle," this editorial proceeds:

They hoped to cut across the traditional economics of the Amazon and deal directly with the tapper, raising his standard of living to a point at which it would have been doubtful whether he would have remained on the job instead of going off to hunt or fish. Their plans called for the gift to the tappers and their wives of a great variety of supplies and equipment including sewing machines and bathtubs.

As I have already said, no one knows the actual, dollar-and-cents size of our Latin American boondoggle. It is obviously more than it ought to be.

How much more it is than it ought to be can only be fully appreciated when it is put alongside the sum total of all our expenditures, commitments and extensions of credit in Latin America. For the fact is that, due to the inpouring

of American dollars and American credit, many of these countries, in their governments and in their upper economic brackets, are on the crest of a wave of unprecedented prosperity. There was never a time in all their history when some of them were in such good position to do for themselves what we are insisting we must do for them.

I insist, Mr. President, that any non-military project, any nonwar enterprise, any undertaking directly concerned with defense, which any Latin American nation is able to handle for itself, but which we do instead, deserves to be put into the "boondoggle" classification. It may, like the building of hospitals, be a good idea; like the building of sewage systems, it may be a commendable idea; like the construction of roads, it may be a useful idea. But whenever these things are done and largely paid for by us when they could be done and largely paid for by these prospering nations, then, Mr. President, the idea, insofar as it involves the United States Treasury, is unnecessary and unsound.

Of course, the New Deal would like to have me omit part of the picture of our good-neighbor New Deal. They would like to have me omit it because to see the whole picture is to see, at once, how inexcusable and demoralizing some of our Latin American ventures are.

Thus, and for these reasons, Mr. President, what I am talking about now, what I was talking about last November, is "our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit" in Latin America during the 3 years 1942, 1943, and 1944. To talk about anything less than that would be to conceal part of the truth.

I am not particularly concerned by the slurs and innuendos which, after my first report, were directed at me. If that is the best level on which the New Deal can defend itself in Latin America, then that fact speaks for itself. I do not propose to reply to the New Deal on the New Deal's level. I have something better with which to reply.

I am interested in the truth about our Latin American operations. I am interested in it because I believe that getting the truth is the first and most important step toward the establishment of a good-neighbor policy that will be better than the New Deal; better for us and better for Latin America.

In the interest of the truth there are, however, certain facts about the New Deal's attack on my report which should be a part of this record. The first fact is the gigantic disagreement not between myself and the new dealers but between the new dealers themselves. Immediately following my report, Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, made a statement in which, according to the Associated Press, he said:

Spending and commitments to spend in Latin America in the last 3 years by all Government agencies, including military and naval installations, total less than \$600,000,000.

How astronomically wrong Mr. Rockefeller is can be gathered from a brief

study of the document containing certified expenditures of \$5,733,953,534, the document to which I have been referring. But what is more interesting at this point is not the gulf that divides Mr. Rockefeller from the facts; what is more interesting is the gulf which divides Mr. Rockefeller's purported facts from the purported facts of other administration spokesmen.

On the same day on which Mr. Rockefeller made his statement the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] also made a statement. His statement, like that of Mr. Rockefeller, was on behalf of the administration. The Senator presented certain figures. Of course, I do not believe that the figures which he used were his own figures. I have too great respect for the Senator as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee to believe that they were his own figures.

But the interesting fact is that the Senator from Tennessee and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs both purported to give the same figures, and yet they were not the same figures. They missed being the same figures by more than a billion and a half dollars. The Senator said:

If I understand correctly, \$2,207,000,000 is all that has been spent down there for every purpose, including the purchase of war material.

Mr. Rockefeller says \$600,000,000. The Senator from Tennessee says \$2,207,000,000. That is a discrepancy of \$1,607,000,000. It is a discrepancy which, to adopt the phrase of another, "is not picayune."

Now, perhaps Mr. Rockefeller and the Senator from Tennessee were talking about different things. Perhaps they were drawing from different sources. Perhaps they talked to different people. I don't know. It is not important that I should know. What I do know is that I had said "our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit to Latin America during the 3 years—1942, 1943, 1944—total more than \$6,000,000,000," a figure that is now proved to be 95.5 percent right. That is what I was talking about, Mr. President. Mr. Rockefeller and the Senator from Tennessee wanted to give the impression that that was what they were talking about. They gave that impression. To give any other kind of impression would not have served their purpose which was to cast doubt upon the authenticity of what I had said.

But there is more to this. On December 13 the distinguished Senator from Tennessee took up the discussion again. This time he brought with him a wholly new set of figures. This time he said:

Now, Mr. President, I am here with the actual facts. I present first an over-all picture of all our expenditures and operations for the last 3 years in Latin America. I hope the Senators will listen carefully as I read the figures.

The net figure, the over-all total which he read in this case was \$1,483,373,000.

That is \$723,000,000 less than his previous total. It is still \$883,373,000 more than the total of Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. President, when the administration's spokesmen, with the energetic cooperation of the New Deal bookkeeper, go so far wrong, is it surprising that a member of the opposition, who has to dig for the facts, can only be 95.5 percent right? Confronted with such conflict and contradiction, is it surprising that the people of Latin America, instead of being filled with good neighborliness, are filled with doubt and suspicion? Or, being witness to such a spectacle of confusion, is it any wonder that the American people who desire to have a good-neighbor policy in which they can have faith, are filled with distrust for the good-neighbor New Deal?

If I may presume to say so, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, expert at figures though he is, appears, in this instance, to have been taken for a New Deal ride. He gives the impression that he is talking about the same thing I am talking about. It is only by appearing to talk about what I talked about that he can discredit my figures. But unhappily, the Senator was not talking about the same thing I was talking about. He was talking about something else altogether.

I said that our "actual expenditures, commitments and extensions of credit on Latin America during the years 1942, 1943, and 1944 amounted to more than \$6,000,000,000." That figure has now been proved to be 95.5 percent right. But back there in November, the Senator from Tennessee was trying to prove that I was 95 percent wrong. How did he go about it? Well, I am sure that the Senator did not go about it at all. I am sure that the trick employed originated somewhere else.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to say that that statement is unqualifiedly incorrect. I made that speech myself. I made the investigation myself. I had such help as I could obtain, but no one has ever and so long as I live no one ever will speak for me either directly or indirectly on this floor. I am responsible for those figures, and no one else is.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I want to assure the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I intended no reflection whatever on him or on his ability. I respect the Senator's ability as highly as does every other Member of this body. But I think if the Senator will wait until I finish this sentence he will appreciate its import and understand what I mean. I think he was misled, and I still think so.

For the 3-year period from which the Senator drew his totals was not the same 3-year period from which I drew mine. It was a different period. It was not the years 1942, 1943, and 1944. It was the years 1941, 1942, and 1943.

I do not know what the correct total for the Senator's period is; whether it is the Senator's first figure or the Senator's second figure or Mr. Rockefeller's figure or some other figure. I do not know and I have not made any effort to find out. For that is not the period I was talking about. It is not the period I am talking about now. What I am talking about is the figure for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944. The certified total for that period is \$5,733,953,534, or 95.5 percent of the sum I said that it was in November.

Mr. President, I want to be charitable about this. I have, now, a better understanding than I ever had before of just what sort of deviousness and deceptions anyone runs afoul of who tries to get the truth about what is happening in our Latin-American operations.

Just lately a very good, but by no means exceptional, illustration of what I mean came to hand. This concerns our \$78,000,000 effort to get rubber out of the Amazon jungle; the effort which the Herald Tribune's correspondent characterized as a gigantic boondoggle now trimmed down to a W. P. A.

In his reply to my first report to the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee took exception to what I had said about this rubber undertaking. He said that in return for our \$78,000,000 we had received 30,000 tons of raw rubber. A short time after the Senator introduced his figure, the head of the Rubber Development Corporation appeared before the Gillette committee and offered his figure. He said that for our \$78,000,000 we had received 24,000 tons of rubber. Well, that is a 6,000-ton discrepancy to start with.

But the counsel for the Gillette committee, like a good many of us, was unwilling to take the administration's statement at face value. He put the pressure on Mr. Allen and other witnesses and the facts began to ooze out. He found that that 24,000 tons that we were getting for our \$78,000,000 was not net increase. Not at all. Before the war, before we spent our \$78,000,000, we were already getting 16,000 tons. So that reduces the net return. It reduces it—to use Mr. Allen's figures—to a net of 8,000 tons.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will admit that it was not 30,000 pounds? Do I understand the Senator to say that he admits that it was not 30,000 pounds? It was not 30,000 pounds.

Mr. BUTLER. No; the fact of the matter is, I will say to my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, that the copy of the report which I made, from which the Senator prepared his text, was the unproven or unchecked report, and the error did not appear in my final report to the committee. That error was eliminated.

Continuing with the same illustration.

The pressure was continued and more facts appeared. When we went into the Amazon jungle with our \$78,000,000, it

seemed that we entered into an agreement with Brazil. By the terms of that agreement, Brazil gets the first 10,000 tons of what we take out. That further reduces our net return. It not only reduces it, it wipes it out entirely. It replaces it with a deficit. For our \$78,000,000 it now seems that we are not getting 30,000 tons net gain; we are not getting 24,000 tons net gain. We are getting, in fact, 2,000 tons less than we got before we started.

Is it any wonder that the truth is hard to get at? Is it any wonder that such effort is made to see to it that we do not get at the truth?

In the administration's reply to my original report, a good deal was made of the loans of the Export-Import Bank to Latin America. We were left to draw the inference that our loans down there are a good risk. Well, Mr. President, I, for one, hope they are a good risk. We need a few foreign loans like that. But I cannot refrain from recalling that, some years ago, a great many private banking institutions in the United States floated loans in some of these countries. Bonds of these countries were bought by thousands of United States citizens. The total amount of the private, United States loans to Latin America which are now in default is \$1,700,000,000. I hope that that bitter experience is not symptomatic. But any ordinary banker, Mr. President, would be bound to give the fact some consideration before he loaned any more money.

Some of the loans made by the Export-Import Bank have been repaid. That is all to the good. I hope they will all be repaid. But the process of repaying them will, I think, bear some scrutiny. For example, in the laws of the Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 92, I come upon this paragraph:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed \$2,700,000 to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Republic of Panama an amount equivalent to the principal and interest paid by that government on account of the credit of \$2,500,000 made available to it by the Export-Import Bank for the construction of Panama's share of the Chorrera-Rio Hato Highway and to pay to the Export-Import Bank an amount sufficient to liquidate the remaining obligation of the Republic of Panama to that bank on account of the aforesaid credit.

In other words, Mr. President, the Export-Import Bank loaned to Panama \$2,500,000. Then the United States Treasury was authorized to give to Panama \$2,700,000 with which to pay back that sum to the Export-Import Bank, plus interest. I am glad that the Export-Import Bank is being repaid. I think the process of repayment needs to be studied. Please note that the Republic of Panama is not the Canal Zone. It is an independent government, over which we have no control.

Now, the new dealers, in connection with my report, have resorted to another trick. They have raised a great uproar to the effect that I attacked the good-neighbor policy. That is another revela-

tion of New Deal strategy. It is of a piece with its other dishonesties.

The principle of the good-neighbor policy is above partisan dispute. It is agreed to by both parties. Like the war and its successful prosecution, that principle is not a political issue. That, Mr. President, makes it all the easier for the new dealers to make New Deal use of it. They can hide themselves behind that principle, just as they hide themselves and their purposes back of the war effort. They then can say, as they said about me, that any criticism of what is being done under the guise of the good-neighbor policy is, ipso facto, a criticism of the principle of that policy. That is their strategy. In this case, at least, they will not get away with it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. My question is merely a humble, everyday sort of question. While the war is going on and while the nations south of us, in Latin America, for the most part are with us, does the Senator conceive that such an explanatory speech as the one he is making in the Senate today, in which he directly or indirectly criticizes our neighbors and our dealings with them, contributes to the good-neighbor relations which should exist between our country and our Latin American neighbors?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded his question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall be very glad to answer it with a plain "Yes." I think I am making a contribution to the genuine good-neighbor policy. I have just completed a trip through the 20 Latin American countries. I have visited them. I know most of their rulers personally through a short meeting. I have talked with them. I have talked with business interests, Americans, and representatives of the native countries. I have talked with representatives and members of our own embassies. I am confident that I am making a contribution to the good neighborliness between our country and the 20 Latin American countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in the kindest way in which I am capable of expressing myself, looking at the matter just as I think a Senator should look at it, as an American should look at it, I beg to differ with the Senator. I believe the kind of explanatory speech the Senator is making, keeping up or attempting to keep up a controversy which has simmered down, to say the least, does not do our country any good in this time of war. I say that in the utmost kindness, because I know the Senator would not intentionally stir up things. But, instead of helping our good-neighbor policy, I am very much afraid the Senator's speech will tend to hurt that policy—although I hope it will not—rather than help it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I appreciate what my good friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has had to say. Before the conclusion of my

remarks, which are just about finished, I think he will feel as I do, that I am endeavoring, at least, to make a genuine contribution to the good-neighbor policy. I believe as heartily as does any Member of this body in the principle of the good-neighbor policy. I have tried to support that principle.

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a letter I received from our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, shortly after my return from the trip through South America. We all recall that Cordell Hull is a former distinguished Member of this body. I am proud of his letter. I think I shall read it at this time, because I believe it is a direct answer to the question just propounded to me by the Senator from Tennessee. The letter is dated August 28, 1943, is addressed to me, and is signed by Cordell Hull. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I take pleasure in transmitting herewith a summary of the events of your visit to Chile, together with a set of Chilean newspaper clippings regarding the event. You will undoubtedly be pleased to know that Ambassador Bowers in forwarding these clippings said:

"Senator BUTLER made an excellent impression here in his contacts with Chileans, in his speech before the Chilean Senate, and in the remarks made during a press conference arranged for him by the Embassy."

"I think particularly praiseworthy was his statement, made frequently in conversation and in his press conference, that possible change in the administration as a result of future elections would not alter the fundamental policy of the United States of cooperation with South America."

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. President, I am glad to have in this record that testimony from Mr. Hull and from our Ambassador to Chile, Mr. Bowers. I do not believe now, any more than I did then, that a change in administrations would alter the fundamental policy of the United States toward Latin America. But, Mr. President, such a change would greatly alter some of the things that are now going on under the cloak of that policy—alter them for the great benefit of ourselves and of our neighbors.

In the article which I wrote in the December issue of Reader's Digest, *Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America*, I said almost the same thing. I wrote:

The answer to all this is not to scrap the good-neighbor policy. The answer is to make it authentically good neighbor. Neighborliness is a two-way proposition. We should stop trying to be rich uncle to Latin America. We should insist that, according to their ability to pay, what we do for the nations of Latin America is matched, dollar for dollar, by what Latin America does for itself. This is not merely sound sense from the standpoint of our own interests.

It is sound sense for the interests and self-respect of Latin America. When we begin to make that our first aim, then we will begin to merit the respect we have not won and cannot buy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator seems to have been an advocate of our South and Central America good-neighbor

policy up to last August. As I understood the reading of the letter, the Senator stated that it made no difference which party came into power, we all upheld the good-neighbor policy.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. What has caused the Senator to change his mind about the good-neighbor policy which he declared to the South and Central Americans as being good last August, and which he states is not good now?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have stated and restated a number of times that I want to be a good neighbor and that I am a firm believer in a genuine good-neighbor policy. It is the administration of that policy and the things that are being done under the cloak of the New Deal good-neighbor policy to which I am taking exception.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if that is correct, I wonder what change has taken place. Mr. Hull was the leader, the staunch advocate of the good-neighbor policy. When the Senator wrote him last August, and when the Secretary of State wrote to the Senator last August, both were upholding that policy. Mr. Hull is the same administrator of that policy now that he was then. Why has the change come about in the Senator's view about that policy?

Mr. BUTLER. The very next sentence of my statement will answer the Senator's question.

That, Mr. President, is the crux of the matter. I believe in the good-neighbor policy when it is the instrument of good neighborliness. I do not believe in the good-neighbor New Deal, for that is not an instrument of good neighborliness.

That is not my opinion alone, Mr. President. Let me read the opinion of Marquis Childs, the newspaperman whom I have already quoted. From the capital city of Brazil, Rio de Janeiro, Mr. Childs wrote:

A new phase in the relationship not merely between Brazil and the United States but between North and South America is about to begin. The honeymoon is nearly over. For this reason, perhaps, certain signs of strain and stress are evident that might have been overlooked in the immediate past. For one thing, rivalry between United States agencies—a reflection of the rivalry that prevails in Washington—is more in evidence. * * * The Brazilians are polite but they do not conceal the doubts they feel about the presence of so many Americans in their midst. They refer to the coming of the North Americans as an invasion of friendly paratroopers and they put an ironic inflection on the word "friendly."

This, Mr. President, is not merely the opinion of North Americans. It is an opinion that is increasingly expressed by intelligent Latin Americans. Here, for example, is the testimony of Manuel Seoane. Manuel Seoane is the editor of Chile's leading magazine. After paying tribute as every observer must, to the fact that our good-neighbor enterprise has, as he puts it, "made some progress," he states, in an article in Harper's magazine of last February:

Most of the work accomplished in the past two and a half years has not been satisfactory from the Latin point of view.

Here, again, is the testimony of another distinguished Latin American journalist, Benjamin Subercaseaux. Writing in the *Nation* on last September 11, he said:

We all know that it is easier to build a ship in 10 days than to change a South American into a Yankee in the same length of time. That is why I have been irritated by the standardized, mechanical, and unimaginative applications of the good-neighbor policy. In short, I am so fed up with everything connected with the good-neighbor policy that I am almost sick of this very article as I write it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understood, the Senator placed in the *RECORD* a few moments ago a letter from Secretary Hull dated last August, in reply to a letter which the Senator wrote him, enclosing certain clippings.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me correct the Senator. The letter came unsolicited from Secretary Hull, enclosing clippings and quoting a letter which he had received from Ambassador Bowers, who reported to the Secretary on my visit to Chile.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did he send a copy of the letter from Ambassador Bowers?

Mr. BUTLER. He quoted from it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is quoted from, that is all right.

Mr. BUTLER. It is in the *RECORD*. I will read it to the Senator again.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will read it again.

Mr. BUTLER. Reading only the part which he quotes from Ambassador Bowers:

Senator BUTLER made an excellent impression here in his contacts with Chileans, in his speech before the Chilean Senate, and in the remarks during a press conference arranged for him by the Embassy.

I think particularly praiseworthy was his statement, made frequently in conversation and in his press conference, that possible change in the administration as a result of future elections would not alter the fundamental policy of the United States of co-operation with South America.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator evidently endorsed the policies of the Government with respect to friendly dealings with and good neighborliness toward the South and Central American countries at that time. Otherwise, that letter could not possibly have been written. What I am asking the Senator is, When and for what reason did he change his mind on that subject? The Ambassador says that the Senator made a speech down there endorsing these policies. He endorsed the good-neighbor policy. He endorsed the very policy against which he is now speaking. What caused the Senator to change his mind?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I do not think I have materially changed my position with reference to the good-neighbor policy. I know a great deal more now about the operation of certain programs and projects which are pretended to be carried on under the cloak of the good-neighbor policy. I still believe in the basic, fundamental principles of the

good-neighbor policy; but the basic, fundamental principles are not what I am talking about today.

Mr. McKELLAR. What country was the Senator visiting at that time?

Mr. BUTLER. Chile.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many countries had the Senator visited when he got to Chile?

Mr. BUTLER. About 10 up to that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is about half of them.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator should have had some idea of the practices under the good-neighbor policy by that time.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. For that reason I am wondering why he so thoroughly endorsed the good-neighbor policy before the Chilean Legislature.

Mr. BUTLER. I am still endorsing the fundamental principles of the good-neighbor policy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senator state to the Chilean Legislature that he endorsed the fundamental principles?

Mr. BUTLER. A copy of the speech which I made is in the *RECORD*. I do not happen to have it before me. It is very brief.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will look at it in the *RECORD*. That will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have quoted from distinguished journalists of Chile. I ask, Is it the principle of good neighborliness that these gentlemen cry out against? Because they do not like what is taking place under the good-neighbor cloak, are we to conclude that they do not want to be good neighbors? Not at all. They are "fed up," they are alarmed, not at the good-neighbor policy itself; they are "fed up" and alarmed at the good-neighbor New Deal.

I have already referred to the December revolution in Bolivia. Bolivia, Mr. President, next to Brazil, is probably the most important country in Latin America in the matter of our war effort. From Bolivia we get great quantities of tin; we get tungsten and antimony and other raw materials needed for the war. If there were any place in Latin America where our good-neighbor policy as currently practiced should have produced neighborly results, Bolivia is the place.

But something else was produced. In the face of our certain victory in the war, and in spite of the outpourings of multiplied millions in that country, Bolivia staged a revolution which threw out its good-neighbor New Deal government and established in its place a government more friendly to the Axis. I do not presume to have an insider's knowledge of the facts about that revolution; but I do say that if our good-neighbor policy, as currently practiced, had been producing genuine good neighborliness, that revolution would not have occurred.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there are signs that Bolivia is no isolated case of hostility toward the United States. There are ominous signs that that feel-

ing is rapidly spreading. Let me read here, the summary printed in *Time* magazine of January 10, a summary which was reached from evidence gathered by *Time's* correspondents throughout Latin America:

Reports were heard of plots in other Latin American countries—Venezuela, Chile, Peru. Some were mere rumors, but it was obvious that a continental current was flowing. The success of the "colonels' clique" in Argentina, if underlined by a similar "major's" clique in Bolivia might encourage further army officer revolts. These might be purely nationalist in origin, not necessarily instigated by outsiders, but they would probably take Fascist forms and look to Argentina for support. Then the United States would be confronted by a powerful anti-democratic bloc within the good-neighbor clique.

Mr. President, I do not presume to have an insider's knowledge of the continental currents to which *Time* refers. But I know that they are not good neighborly currents. I know that if our good-neighbor policy, as currently practiced, were producing good neighborliness they would not be stirring.

In our relations with Latin America, Mr. President, the time is upon us to put an end to deception, and to face the facts. What will it avail us if when democracy has won in the Old World we discover that it has lost in the new? What will it avail us if we make arrangements to keep the peace in the Atlantic and in the Pacific and, meanwhile, fail to make and keep the peace in the Western Hemisphere? Of what good will it be if we make friends of all the world and fail to make friends of our own neighbors?

I do not want to see us go backward. I want to see us go forward. I want to see us go forward with a good-neighbor policy, the fruits of which, through thick and thin, in good times and bad times, are an authentic and bona fide good neighborliness.

Mr. President, I believe that I made it plain during my discourse that the audited and certified reports which I submitted were to be printed in the *RECORD* following my speech. I now ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD* as follows:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE LATIN AMERICAN REPUBLICS AND IN POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CARIBBEAN AREA FOR THE YEARS 1942, 1943, AND 1944

(Report to the Honorable HUGH A. BUTLER, U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 18, 1944.

The Honorable HUGH A. BUTLER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We have examined certain lists, prepared by your office, of expenditures, obligations, commitments, encumbrances, authorizations, loans, and extensions of credit by the United States Government in Latin America and in the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944.

These items have been listed separately for the Latin American republics and for the possessions of the United States, and the lists have been designated schedule 1 and schedule

2, respectively. Copies of these lists, which are attached hereto, may be summarized as follows:

Schedule 1: South and Central American items and amounts (exclusive of Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands).....	\$5,733,953,534
Schedule 2: Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands items and amounts not included in the preceding table.....	662,806,970

Total..... 6,396,760,504

Comments, explanations, and other information contained in these schedules were not examined or verified by us.

We hereby certify that the source material referred to in these lists has been examined by us and that the amounts shown are correct according to the source information.

JAMES A. COUNCILOR & Co.,
Certified Public Accountants.

SCHEDULE 1.—South and Central American items and amounts (exclusive of Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands)

1. Defense Plant Corporation, capital investment in Latin America.....	\$53,580,850
Source: List supplied by Department of Commerce, transmitted by letter of W. L. Clayton dated Jan. 14, 1944.	
This represents plants built in Latin American countries at United States expense, and no determination of final ownership has been made, as far as is known. This figure represents the actual expenditures made and the commitments made to complete projects authorized as of June 30, 1943.	
2. Defense Supplies Corporation, capital investment in Latin America.....	14,742,353
Source: Same as above.	
This represents expenditures and commitments for establishment of facilities in Latin America other than plants referred to above. The remainder of the comment of item No. 1 applies.	
3. Metals Reserve Company, capital investments in Latin America.....	6,829,615
Source: Same as above.	
Comment of item No. 2 applies.	
4. Rubber Reserve Company and Rubber Development Corporation, capital investments in Latin America.....	54,991,845
Source: Same as above.	
Comment of item No. 2 applies.	
5. Export-Import Bank loans, authorizations, credits extended and commitments.....	778,982,997
Source: Letter over the signature of Jesse Jones, dated Nov. 24, 1943.	
Total authorizations as of June 15, 1943, stood at \$767,153,707. Previously \$65,928,927 has been authorized, extended, and subsequently repaid or refinanced so that no part thereof was outstanding as of June 15, 1943. Thus the over-all credit commitment of the United States through the Export-Import Bank, related to Latin America totaled \$823,082,634. Many of these loans have been made to development corporations of Latin American countries. They range in purpose from financing steel mills and other industrialization programs to financing handicraft projects and hat-manufacturing aid. However, the documented figure used, though smaller, is from the letter from Jesse Jones described above.	
6. The Department of State, for cooperation with American republics, fiscal 1942, 1943, and 1944.....	\$,385,300
Source: The Budget, 1944, p. 619 and subsequent.	
These items are the appropriation figures as shown in the Budget (1944). They do not include the State Department expenses for the diplomatic staffs in Latin American countries and other State Department normal peacetime activities in Latin America.	
7. Commodity Credit Corporation commitments, completed purchases, loans on commodities.....	436,580,000
Source: Tabulation submitted by J. B. Hutson, President of the Com-	

modity Credit Corporation, transmitted by letter, dated Dec. 11, 1943, which tabulation shows total loans and commitments for fiscal 1943 and fiscal 1944.

Due to discrepancies in reports from Government agencies, the overall exact amount is not believed to be reflected in this figure. It should be noted that the date given is July 31, 1943. Thus, if the figure were known of purchases made and commitments made since Aug. 31, 1943, the total reflected to the left would be higher. Also, under date of Nov. 24, 1943, in a letter, C. G. Garman, Acting Director of Finance of the Department of Agriculture, states that, "... obligations for the fiscal year 1943 are now estimated at \$175,796,000," and he states, "obligations for the first half of fiscal year 1944 are now estimated roughly at \$107,465,000." These two figures total \$283,261,000. He does not show the purchases and commitments of 1942, nor for the other half of fiscal 1944, nor the commitments. Thus, taking the reported figure of \$289,755,711, completed transactions admitted as of Aug. 31, 1943, and adding the \$107,465,000 for fiscal 1944 (still omitting the figure commitments) the total would be \$397,220,711. Further, if purchases for the last half of fiscal 1944 were to be added plus all commitments for the future, it is obvious that the total would be still higher. No criticism of purchases of Latin American commodities is intended except only insofar as premium prices which cost the United States Government needless sums are involved.

8. Reconstruction Finance Corporation, subsidiary purchases in Latin America.....

Source: Letter dated Nov. 24, 1943, signed by Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, which states: "The R. F. C. and its subsidiaries have expended \$1,001,361,060 through Oct. 31, 1943, for purchases in Latin America."

The other \$1,000,000,000 is supported by a letter from Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, to Senator McKellar, dated Dec. 8, 1943, which states: "The commitments growing out of our over-all agreements are necessarily open end and in their nature, it is impossible to make an accurate estimate of what they will aggregate, but the figure of \$1,000,000,000 that I gave Senator BUTLER will, I am sure be sufficient to cover it." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 13, 1943, p. 10579 and p. 10571 note.)

No criticism of these expenditures is intended insofar as they were made for the purchase of essential supplies. However, operating under the former B. E. W. directives, the R. F. C. was forced to purchase supplies in Latin America at inordinately high premium prices which have cost the U. S. Government needless sums. This over-all \$2,000,000,000 of purchases and commitments is shown for the specific reason to permit investigation of the sum as a whole, in order to determine the amount of needless loss caused to the U. S. Government in this immense procurement program. Mr. Jesse Jones himself has cautioned against such loss and pointed out in annual reports which he has filed for his agencies, the loss which the premium-price-purchase procedure is causing. This is particularly reflected in the R. F. C. annual report, December 1942.

9. Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, expenditures, commitments, contractual authorizations, corporation capitalization authority and interagency fund transfers.....

Source: Hearings before House subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations, p. 171, table inserted by Nelson Rockefeller showing total expenditures up to Apr. 19, 1943, \$75,218,000. Appropriation for Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, fiscal 1944, Public Law No. 139, 78th Cong., p. 9, appropriation direct \$30,735,000 and in addition contract authorization of \$18,000,000. Funds authorized to be allocated from O. E. M. available for the use of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs \$69,919,000 (unrestricted), 55 Stat. 813. Coordinator of Inter-American

Affairs, with power to create and capitalize corporations, O. E. M., \$28,638,000 (additional), Stat. 56, p. 708. Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics (O. E. M.) \$1,600,000 (additional), Stat. 55, p. 543. Contract authorization of Coordinator \$3,000,000 (additional), Stat. 55, p. 543. Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs with power to create and capitalize corporations (O. E. M.) \$5,000,000 (additional), Stat. 56, p. 906.

The total over-all expenditures and commitments by the Coordinator's office, as shown by the detailed explanation above, should properly include all figures presented since the completed expenditures, as evidenced by the hearings table alone, were \$75,218,000. Thus, the fiscal 1944 appropriations and the transfers from O. E. M. must be included to arrive at the over-all total reflected to the left. Further any inference that such expenditures have not been made, or the funds not obligated, would be erroneous, since the Treasurer's report shows none of these funds as "Unexpended balances."

10. Gold and silver purchases from Mexico:	
For first quarter of 1942.....	\$34,260,000
For first quarter of 1943.....	5,915,000
Gold and silver purchases from Peru:	
For first quarter of 1942.....	4,567,000
For first quarter of 1943.....	2,800,000
Source: Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs release, Inter-American Economic News, No. 64, p. 3, August 1943.	
These are in the form of agreements and/or purchases from the countries named. Attention should be directed to them because the United States mines have been closed down or their operations greatly curtailed while at the same time purchases for other countries are being made which means an income to them from the U. S. Treasury. These are from only 2 Latin American countries for only 2 quarters. When the Treasurer's 1943 report is released the total may be reflected as much greater.	
11. United States stabilization fund agreement provided use of:	
For Mexico.....	40,000,000
For Ecuador.....	5,000,000
Source: U. S. Treasury, Annual Report, fiscal 1942, p. 42.	
12. U. S. Bureau of Mines transfer to Interdepartmental Committee on Cooperation with the American Republics for Technical Aid:	
Mining, 1943.....	58,000
U. S. Bureau of Mines, 1942.....	50,000
Source: Letter dated Nov. 27, 1943, from U. S. Bureau of Mines signed by R. R. Sayers.	
13. United States defrayed costs of U. S. Department of Agriculture for experimental station in Ecuador through Ecuadorian corporation, Oct. 20, 1942, including recreational facilities, tennis courts, and swimming pool.....	75,000
And loan to Ecuadorian corporation for same (plus salaries of scientists and supplies for station).....	150,000
Source: Stat. 56, p. 1792.	
14. U. S. Department of Interior, Geological Survey Department, expense in Latin America.....	300,390
Source: Letter dated Dec. 8, 1943, from U. S. Department of Interior signed by Thomas B. Nolan.	
15. Inter-American Radio Office.....	17,000
Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	
16. Inter-American Trademark Bureau.....	42,000
Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	
17. Pan American Institute of Geography and History.....	30,000
Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	
18. Inter-American Coffee Board.....	30,000
Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	
19. Inter-American Indian Institute.....	13,000
Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	
20. Inter-American Statistical Institute.....	58,000
Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	
21. Direct contributions to Republic of Panama, 1942, 1943, 1944.....	1,290,000
Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	

22. Contribution to Pan American Sanitary Bureau, 1942, 1943, 1944. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	\$180,000	ration and its subsidiaries in connection with the war, as of Oct. 31, 1942 (RFC-1710, Dec. 15, 1942, p. 10).		50. Expenditures and/or authorizations of War Department funds in Latin America:	
23. Contribution to Pan American Union, 1942, 1943, 1944. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 615.	779,600	38. Costs of movement of Latin-American sugar to United States defrayed by Defense Supplies Corporation. Source: Same as above, p. 10.	\$30,000,000	(a) Construction of airfields, materials, labor, and supervision.	\$346,134,000
24. Mexican fishery mission. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 620.	28,200	39. Appropriation by Defense Supplies Corporation for training citizens of other American republics as aviation pilots and technicians. Source: Same as above, p. 11.	1,488,600	(b) Personal services other than construction.	5,857,000
25. Foreign inter-American expenditure to record folk music in other American republics. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 620.	12,500	40. Lend-Lease Administration: Total shipments to Latin America. Source: Substantiation of this total is found in the thirteenth report to Congress on Lend-Lease operations for period ended Nov. 30, 1943, showing at p. 36, Lend-Lease Shipments to Latin America.	116,543,000	(c) Military matériel. (These amounts are for the fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944.) Source: Letter of Dec. 10, 1943, from Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Dec. 13, 1943, at p. 10588.	125,000,000
26. Survey of collections of Latin-American music and preparation of bibliographies of Latin American music. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 620.	10,900	Under column 6 of Lend-lease exports, column headed "Other." All other known zones where lend-lease aid has been distributed have been included under other preceding columns. Thus, the total of \$484,000,000 for lend-lease exports should be applicable to Latin America. In addition, Mr. East, of the Lend-Lease Administration, stated that these exports as reflected in this table run approximately 50 percent behind the authorizations of lend-lease for the nations to whom commitments have been made. Thus, on that basis, lend-lease aid to Latin America may be computed, by the process of reason as \$800,000,000 or more. Further, Mr. East stated that the figures shown in this table do not include that lend-lease aid which comes from the Army and Navy appropriations which are authorized for lend-lease use. In other words, this portion of lend-lease aid is only that portion which comes from the lend-lease appropriations, i. e., the \$18,410,000,000 of direct lend-lease appropriations. The other two appropriation sources are (a) the Navy (b) the Army. See Lend-Lease report of Dec. 31, 1942.		51. Navy Department, Bureau of Yards and Docks: Total public works authorized for Central and South America. Source: Letter of Nov. 22, 1943, from Rear Admiral B. Moreell.	292,964,340
27. Preparation of transcripts for radio broadcasts in Spanish and Portuguese. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 620.	3,000	41. Rubber Development Corporation: Expenditures for rubber acquisition program and collateral facilities attendant thereto. Source: Statement made by Douglas H. Allen, president, Rubber Development Corporation, before Gillette committee of the U. S. Senate, in response to a request "for information concerning the procurement of rubber from South America, and the expenditures connected therewith," transmitted by letter from Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, dated December 13, 1943, \$83,040,998; less \$54,993,845 shown in item 4 as capital investments. Thus, net additional expenditures by Rubber Development Corporation.	28,047,153	52. Naval aid to the American Republics. Source: Statement in communication from Secretary Knox to Senator McKellar, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; Dec. 13, 1943, p. 10587. (This does not duplicate other items but is direct expenses by the Navy, according to the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Secretary Knox, which is as follows: "Current expenses of the U. S. Navy in other American republics during the fiscal years 1941-43 amounted to \$24,021,000. This figure includes expenditures as reported by disbursing officers located ashore throughout the American republics, including Guantanamo, approximately \$13,000,000; Rio de Janeiro, approximately \$4,000,000; Recife, approximately \$1,500,000. The figure does not include maintenance and operating expenses of fleet units operating in and around the other American republics.")	24,021,000
28. Guide to official publications of Latin America. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 620.	29,000				
29. Law guide and center of Latin-American legal studies. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 620.	37,600			53. U. S. Department of Agriculture, expenditures for programs in Latin American republics:	
30. Preparation of a handbook of the South American Indians. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 620.	35,993			Fiscal year 1942.....	270,000
31. Eighth Pan-American Child Congress. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 621.	13,979			Fiscal year 1943.....	288,000
32. International Committee on Political Refugee Settlement Aid of Immigrants of Other Countries to Latin America. Source: The Budget, 1944, p. 621.	17,079			Fiscal year 1944 (estimated).....	379,000
33. Second Inter-American Travel Congress. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 622.	3,500			Source: Letter of Dec. 11, 1943, from Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture.	
34. Fourth Pan-American Highway Congress. Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 622.	6,500			54. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations—Subsidies to United States exporters to encourage shipment of cotton, wheat, and flour to Latin America:	
35. Total Department of Agriculture appropriations for rubber projects in Latin America. This amount does not include the sum of \$2,000,000 authorized to be paid to the Inter-Continental Rubber Co. for its rights, properties, and facilities, and the rights, properties, and facilities of its subsidiaries (56 Stat. 127). This is presumed, therefore, to exclude all expenditures in the United States and cover only those for Latin America, thus the known expenditures in California are excluded. Sources: Western Hemisphere rubber projects, U. S. Department of Agriculture: For necessary expenses incident to the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants in areas throughout the Western Hemisphere, where the best growths and yields may be expected; for leasing, construction of buildings, and plants; for studies, surveys, and tests, including the employment of aliens and the use of motor equipment for the transportation of laborers from points of assembly to the sites of projects and return and other expenses, \$4,200,000 (56 Stat. 240). Western Hemisphere rubber projects, U. S. Department of Agriculture: For the same purpose, additional amount, \$8,235,000 (56 Stat. 596). Western Hemisphere rubber projects, U. S. Department of Agriculture: For the same purposes, additional amount, \$19,000,000 (56 Stat. 1002). Western Hemisphere rubber projects, U. S. Department of Agriculture: For the same purposes, additional amount, \$13,048,000 (Public Law 129, 78th Cong.).	44,483,000			Fiscal year 1942.....	4,820,000
				Fiscal year 1943.....	6,554,000
				Fiscal year 1944.....	0
				Source: Letter of Dec. 11, 1943, from Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, to Senator Butler.	
				55. Naval station, Guantanamo, Cuba: Additional fleet operating facilities, bomb-proof shelters for communication and personnel, and limited ship repair facilities. Source: 55 Stat. 36.	5,747,500
				These amounts do not include sums advanced by the Commodity Credit Corporation, Lend-Lease Administration, State Department, and the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.	
				NOTE.—Letter addressed to Senator McKellar, p. 10593, Congressional Record, has omitted part of the information, thus a different total.	
				56. Guantanamo, Cuba: Additional hospital facilities, buildings, and accessories and quarters for corpsmen and nurses. Source: 55 Stat. 39.	610,000
				57. Guantanamo, Cuba: Additional fleet operation facilities, bomb-proof shelters for communication and personnel, ship repair facilities. Source: 55 Stat. 40.	5,747,500
				58. British Guiana, Trinidad, Jamaica, Antigua, St. Lucia, and Bahama Islands: Aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories. Source: 55 Stat. 51.	66,050,000
				59. Guantanamo, Cuba: Additional hospital facilities, including buildings and accessories, quarters for corpsmen and nurses. Source: 55 Stat. 52.	610,000
				60. Guantanamo, Cuba; improvement of power plant. Source: 55 Stat. 164.	120,000
				61. Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations. Source: 55 Stat. 272.	100,000
				62. International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, Rio Grande rectification and canalization projects. Source: 55 Stat. 273.	200,000

63. Lower Rio Grande flood-control projects; construction, acquiring of easements. Source: 55 Stat. 274.	\$950,000	penses while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, of Army officers and military students of the other American republics. Source: 56 Stat. 628.	\$500,000	governments to the United States, the accrued and unpaid interest thereon and payments on account of principal and interest as of Nov. 15, 1942.	\$12,455,327
64. Rio Grande canalization project, including reconstruction or replacement of certain bridges. Source: 55 Stat. 274.	440,000	87. Mexico, for the enforcement of foreign plant quarantines for cotton and cottonseed for Mexico, including inspection, cleaning, disinfection of railroad cars, vehicles, freight, express, baggage, construction and repair of buildings, plants and equipment for the fumigation, disinfection and cleaning of products, railroad cars and other vehicles. Source: 56 Stat. 686.	719,550	98. War Shipping Administration defense aid, allocations and obligations to Brazil. Source: Schedule B, following p. 62, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 78th Cong., supplemental appropriations bill.	2,143,500
65. Mexico, for the control and prevention of spread of the Mexican fruit fly, including necessary surveys and control operations in Mexico, in cooperation with the Mexican Government and local Mexican authorities. Source: 55 Stat. 427.	167,960	88. American-Mexican Claims Commission, salaries of 3 members. Source: 56 Stat. 1058.	30,000	99. Foreign Economic Administration expenditures in Latin America. Source: Statement from Foreign Economic Administration included in Senator McKellar's table of Latin American expenditures, p. 10571, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 13, 1943.	3,522,000
66. Inter-American Travel Congress (Second). Source: 55 Stat. 561.	3,500	89. Purchases of the Cuban sugar crop for the years 1942, 1943, 1944. Source: Oral statement of Dr. Bernhard, Sugar Administrator, Department of Agriculture. This oral statement is supported by the written communication from J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to Senator McKellar, dated Dec. 11, 1943, which appears in the Dec. 13, 1943, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at p. 10594.	592,000,000	100. Total amount spent in Ecuador on our troops and on our air base on the islands nearby. Source: Statement in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10574; statement by Senator McKellar in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 13, 1943.	1,400,000
67. Mexico, Agrarian Claims Commission, United States and Mexico, expenses of participation on account of expropriations of agrarian properties. Source: 55 Stat. 562.	15,000	90. Trinidad, development of protected fleet anchorage, collateral items, construction. Source: 55 Stat. 38.	5,100,000	101. Investigation and survey of Canaland highway across Republic of Nicaragua. Source: The Budget, 1944, p. 673.	9,709
68. Guantanamo, Cuba, additional ammunition storage facilities, including buildings and accessories. Source: 55 Stat. 661.	286,000	91. Trinidad, fleet anchorage, including buildings and facilities. Source: 55 Stat. 677.	15,000,000	102. First Inter-American Congress on Indian Life. Source: The Budget, 1943, p. 845.	425
69. Guantanamo, Cuba, additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories. Source: 55 Stat. 663.	210,000	92. Panama, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Republic of Panama an amount equivalent to the principal paid by that Government on account of the credit of \$2,500,000. Made available to it by the Export-Import Bank for the construction of Panama's share of the Chorrera-Rio Hato Highway, and to pay to the Export-Import Bank an amount sufficient to liquidate the remaining obligation of the Republic of Panama to that bank on account of the aforesaid credit. Source: Public Law No. 48, 78th Cong.	2,700,000	103. Eighth Pan-American Child Congress, San Jose, Costa Rica. Source: The Budget, 1943, p. 845.	13,979
70. Guantanamo, Cuba, Naval Station, Guantanamo, Cuba, 2 swimming pools. Source: 55 Stat. 672.	100,000	93. Mexico, fence construction along boundary, United States and Mexico, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. Source: 56 Stat. 477.	15,000	104. Fourth Pan-American Highway Congress. Source: The Budget, 1943, p. 843.	6,500
71. Guantanamo, Cuba, additional ammunition storage facilities, including buildings and accessories. Source: 55 Stat. 676.	286,000	94. Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, American Navigation Corporation (an Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs corporation, incorporated in Delaware on July 15, 1942), United States capital investment on Nov. 30, 1943. Source: Monthly financial statement of corporation filed with U. S. Treasury pursuant to Budget Treasury Regulations No. 2, issued under Executive Order 8512, as amended by Executive Order 9084, Nov. 30, 1943.	500,000	105. Second Inter-American Travel Congress. Source: The Budget, 1943, p. 843.	3,500
72. Guantanamo, Cuba, additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories. Source: 55 Stat. 678.	210,000	95. Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Inter-American Educational Foundation (an Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs corporation, incorporated in Delaware, Sept. 25, 1943, United States capital investment on Nov. 30, 1943. Source: Monthly financial statement of this corporation filed with U. S. Treasury pursuant to Budget Treasury Regulations No. 2, issued under Executive Order 8512, as amended by Executive Order 9084, Nov. 30, 1943.	800,000	106. Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, 1943 and 1944. Source: The Budget, 1944, p. 621.	200,000
73. American-Mexican Claims Commission "necessary expenses". Source: Public Law No. 11, 78th Cong.	700,000	96. Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Institute of Inter-American Affairs (an Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs Corporation, incorporated in Delaware, Mar. 30, 1942), United States capital investment on Nov. 30, 1943. Source: Monthly financial statement of this Corporation filed with U. S. Treasury pursuant to Budget Treasury Regulations No. 2, issued under Executive Order 8512, as amended by Executive Order 9084, Sept. 30, 1943.	17,000,000	107. Preparation of Inter-American Treasury Bulletin. Source: The Budget, 1943, p. 842.	20,000
74. International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, additional amount for salaries and expenses. Source: Public Law No. 11, 78th Cong.	300,000	97. Principal of the funded and unfunded indebtedness of Latin American		108. Direct appropriations for export subsidies on cotton products, wheat and wheat flour exported to all South and Latin American republics. Source: Letter dated Dec. 11, 1943, to Senator McKellar, signed by J. B. Hutson, president of Commodity Credit Corporation. Document in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Dec. 13, 1943, p. 10593; appropriation reference, P. L. No. 320, sec. 32, 74th Cong., 7 U. S. C. 6120.	10,120,070
75. Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee. Source: Public Law No. 79, 78th Cong.	23,000			109. Salaries of only 17 Federal agencies' employees in Latin America. Source: Table and letter from Arthur S. Fleming, Commissioner of U. S. Civil Service Commission, dated Jan. 14, 1944; shows \$7,701,815 per year.	23,105,445
76. Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, American Republics. Source: Public Law No. 80, 78th Cong.	105,560			110. Contribution to improve the food supply of northern Brazil, 2-year contribution by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Source: O. C. I. A. A. Inter-American Economic News, No. 32, Dec. 1942, p. 7, line 13.	2,000,000
77. Mexico, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, salaries and expenses. Source: Public Law No. 105, 78th Cong.	290,000			111. Commitment for Future by Rubber Reserve Company for development of rubber reserves in Bolivia. Source: Page 28, Foreign Commerce Weekly, Aug. 8, 1942, column 3. This is a commitment for the future as contrasted with completed examination.	2,125,000
78. War Department, Inter-American relations for expenses to Secretary of War to promote better relations with other American countries, including transportation and subsistence expenses of Army officers and military students of the other American countries. Source: Public Law No. 108, 78th Cong.	500,000			112. Building new embassies and residences in Latin America: 1942..... 1943..... 1944..... Alterations and repairs, 3 years. Source: Letter dated Jan. 11, 1944, from Department of State, signed by Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.	305,785 376,085 427,990 90,000
79. Department of State, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. Source: Public Law No. 132, 78th Cong.	21,800			113. Rents paid and heat, light, and fuel for Foreign Service in Latin America. Source: Tables transmitted by letter dated Jan. 11, 1944, signed by Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.	192,292
80. Mexico, Rio Grande canalization. Source: Public Law No. 132, 78th Cong.	16,200			114. Loss on purchase of \$1,000,000 worth of Brazil nuts by Foreign Economic Administration from Brazil. Source: Letter from Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of Foreign Economic Administration to Senator Kenneth McKellar, document in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 13, 1943, p. 10586, col. 2.	750,000
81. Inter-American Statistical Institute. Source: 56 Stat. 20.	35,000			115. State Department, obligations for salaries and allowances in the	
82. Mexico, Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. Source: 56 Stat. 476.	239,600				
83. Mexico, Public Works projects under International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, including lower Rio Grande flood control project. Source: 56 Stat. 476.	949,460				
84. Mexico, Douglas-Aguia Prieta sanitation project, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. Source: 56 Stat. 477.	90,000				
85. Mexico, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, additional amount for salaries and expenses Rio Grande rectification and canalization projects. Source: 56 Stat. 600.	50,000				
86. War Department, Inter-American Relations for expenses necessary to promote better relations with other American Republics, including transportation and subsistence ex-					

Foreign Service of the Department of State (regular and auxiliary) in Central and South America for the years (fiscal) 1942 and 1943. This amount is exclusive of office rent, operating expense, travel, etc. Source: Letter to Senator BUTLER from G. Howland Shaw, Assistant Secretary of State, Jan. 17, 1944.

Total..... 5,733,953,534

SCHEDULE 2. Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands items and amounts not included in the preceding table

Item No.		
1.	Securities of the Panama Railroad held by the U. S. Government.....	\$7,000,000
	Source: P. 598, U. S. Treasury Annual Report Fiscal 1942.	
2.	Capital stock, Puerto Rico Cement Corporation.....	1,219,600
	Source: P. 599, U. S. Treasury Annual Report Fiscal 1942.	
3.	Sanitation, Canal Zone, Panama Canal:	
	1942.....	1,024,223
	1943.....	2,157,000
	1944.....	1,546,000
	Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 687; and the Budget for 1943 for the 1942 expenditures, p. 958.	
4.	Maintenance and operation of Panama Canal:	
	1942.....	22,713,086
	1943.....	47,034,637
	1944.....	6,016,000
	Source: The Budget, June 30, 1944, p. 678; and the Budget for 1943 for the 1942 expenditures, p. 948.	
5.	Panama Canal construction costs largely for pay roll to Panamanians and Costa Ricans employed on the project:	
	1942.....	1,111,569,000
	1943.....	107,516,810
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 829; Stat. 56, p. 224.	
6.	Administration of Sugar Act of 1937, United States subsidy and expense of administration of Sugar Act of 1937 for benefit of Cuban, Puerto Rican, and other Latin American countries' sugar-production aid and quota maintenance:	
	1942.....	47,962,910
	1943.....	47,462,910
	1944.....	63,883,060
	Source: Tabulation of Items in the Budget of the U. S. Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, p. 303.	
7.	Hospital care, Canal Zone garrisons..	335,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 126.	
8.	Naval operating base, Balboa, fleet operating and repair facilities, including buildings and accessories, Balboa and Cristobal.....	2,765,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 37.	
9.	Charlotte Amalie, V. I., submarine base and operating facilities, including buildings and accessories, and acquisition of land.....	1,270,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 37.	
10.	Balboa, submarine operating facilities, including buildings and accessories, piers, and dredging.....	1,855,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 37.	
11.	Coco Solo, submarine base and operating facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	1,010,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 37.	
12.	San Juan, P. R., surface craft operating facilities, including buildings and accessories, berthing and housing for personnel, and acquisition of land.....	737,500
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 37.	
13.	Vieques, Puerto Rican area, fleet operating facilities, fleet anchorage, breakwaters, dredging, repair facilities, buildings, accessories, and acquisition of land.....	35,000,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 37.	
14.	Coco Solo, additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	450,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 37.	

¹ The figures for the Panama Canal are included for the reason that over \$200,000,000 have been expended, the majority of which expenditure is for construction and the pay rolls for this construction revert principally to the people of Panama and Costa Rica. Since the money thus goes to support the economy and means substantial income to the people of Panama and Costa Rica it is obvious that additional spending for nonwar purposes by such agencies as the Coordinator's office are neither necessary to the bolstering of their economy nor justifiable as additional welfare expenditures from the U. S. Treasury in wartime.

15.	San Juan, P. R., additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories and breakwater.....	\$1,575,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 38.	
16.	Balboa, development of temporary hospital facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	500,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 39.	
17.	Coco Solo, extension of hospital facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	700,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 39.	
18.	San Juan, P. R., naval hospital quarters for nurses and corpsmen.....	85,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 39.	
19.	Puerto Rico, acquisition, improvements, and development of dry dock, including berthing and repair facilities.....	2,500,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 40.	
20.	Puerto Rico, bomb-proofing communication centers, bomb-proof shelters for personnel, recreational facilities, and acquisition of land.....	650,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 40.	
21.	Canal Zone, bomb-proofing communication centers, bomb-proof shelters for personnel, quarters for officers, and recreational facilities.....	1,340,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 40.	
22.	San Juan, P. R., quarters and accessories for bachelor officers.....	\$200,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 48.	
23.	Charlotte Amalie, V. I., additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories and equipment.....	1,281,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 48.	
24.	Puerto Rico, additional aviation facilities, buildings and accessories and breakwater.....	972,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 48.	
25.	Balboa, fleet operation and repair facilities, buildings and accessories, Balboa and Cristobal.....	2,765,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 50.	
26.	Charlotte Amalie, V. I., additional submarine operating facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	1,270,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 50.	
27.	Coco Solo, additional submarine operating facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	1,010,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 50.	
28.	San Juan, P. R., surface craft operating facilities, including buildings and accessories, berthing and housing for personnel.....	737,500
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 50.	
29.	Vieques, Porto Rico area, fleet operating facilities and anchorage, including breakwaters, dredging, repair facilities, buildings, and accessories.....	5,000,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 50.	
30.	Coco Solo, additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	450,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 50.	
31.	San Juan, P. R., additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories and breakwater.....	1,575,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 51.	
32.	Balboa, development of temporary hospital facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	500,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 52.	
33.	Coco Solo, extension of hospital facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	700,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 52.	
34.	San Juan, P. R., quarters for nurses and corpsmen.....	85,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 52.	
35.	Puerto Rico, acquisition, improvement, development of Puerto Rico drydock, including berthing and repair facilities.....	2,500,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 53.	
36.	Puerto Rico, bombproofing communication centers, bombproof shelters for personnel, and recreational facilities.....	650,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 53.	
37.	Canal Zone, bombproofing communication centers, bombproof shelters for personnel, quarters for officers, and recreational facilities.....	1,340,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 53.	
38.	Virgin Islands, defraying deficits in treasuries of municipal governments, in the Virgin Islands, additional amount because of excess of current expenses over current revenues.....	58,433
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 69.	
39.	Coco Solo, submarine public works shop.....	100,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 164.	
40.	Coco Solo, submarine transit shed and accessories.....	166,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 164.	
41.	Coco Solo, extension of roads, walks, and services.....	244,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 166.	
42.	Coco Solo, extension of storehouse....	\$130,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 166.	
43.	San Juan, P. R., landing-field improvements.....	300,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 166.	
44.	San Juan, P. R., additional parking areas.....	255,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 166.	
45.	San Juan, P. R., extension of barracks and mess hall.....	350,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 166.	
46.	San Juan, P. R., additional bachelor quarters.....	200,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 167.	
47.	San Juan, P. R., additional aviation facilities, including buildings, accessories, and breakwaters, and acquisition of land.....	972,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 167.	
48.	Charlotte Amalie, additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories and equipment, and acquisition of land.....	1,241,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 167.	
49.	Puerto Rico, graving drydock and accessory construction, Caribbean area.....	7,500,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 167.	
50.	District Court of the Panama Canal Zone, for salaries of officials and employees of the District Court of the United States, Panama Canal Zone.....	26,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 299.	
51.	Government of the Virgin Islands, for salaries of the Governor and employees, traveling expenses of officers and employees, other expenses.....	150,075
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 359.	
52.	Government of the Virgin Islands, for salaries and expenses of agricultural experiments taken and vocational schools in the Virgin Islands.....	45,650
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 359.	
53.	Government of the Virgin Islands, for defraying the deficits in the treasuries of the municipal government because of excess of current expenses over current revenues.....	120,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 359.	
54.	Puerto Rican hurricane relief, expenses to continue collection and administration of money due the United States on account of loans made and to make compositions and adjustments on loans—administrative expenses.....	20,000
	Source: Stat. 55, pp. 359-360.	
55.	Puerto Rico, to coordinate the agricultural experiment station work.....	50,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 412.	
56.	Puerto Rico, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins.....	83,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 413.	
57.	Puerto Rico, to enable Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of sec. 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act.....	100,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 414.	
58.	Puerto Rico, for extending from Puerto Rico vocational education and civilian rehabilitation.....	105,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 475.	
59.	Government of the Virgin Islands, survey of public works needs, administrative expenses, employment of engineer or firm of engineers, if necessary, to construct and rehabilitate public works necessary for the welfare of the Virgin Islands.....	5,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 554.	
60.	Balboa, housing for enlisted men, laundry and school facilities.....	900,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 659.	
61.	Vieques, P. R.: Roosevelt Roads, additional development of protected fleet anchorage, including acquisition of land.....	21,970,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 659.	
62.	Charlotte Amalie, V. I., additional development of submarine facilities.....	2,195,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 659.	
63.	Coco Solo, additional power plant, shore patrol headquarters and school facilities.....	885,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 659.	
64.	Balboa, additional ammunition storage facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	165,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 660.	
65.	Coco Solo, additional ammunition storage facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	160,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 660.	
66.	Balboa, expansion of hospital facilities.....	250,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 660.	
67.	Charlotte Amalie, V. I., ammunition storage facilities and including buildings and accessories.....	575,000
	Source: Stat. 55, p. 661.	

68. San Juan, P. R., additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	\$752,000	100. Canal Zone, retirement and disability fund for employees of Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company.....	\$1,177,000	123. Puerto Rican hurricane relief, administrative expenses to continue collection and administration of money due the United States on account of loans and to make compositions and adjustments on loans.....	\$19,950
Source: Stat. 55, p. 662.		Source: Public Law 90, 78th Cong.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 560.	
69. Balboa, utility building and accessories.....	25,000	101. Puerto Rico, to enable Secretary of Agriculture to extend the benefits of sec. 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico.....	140,000	124. Puerto Rico, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate the agricultural experiment station work in Puerto Rico.....	50,000
Source: Stat. 55, p. 662.		Source: Public Law 129, 78th Cong.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 670.	
70. Charlotte Amalie, V. I., radio facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	130,000	102. Puerto Rico, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate agricultural experiment-station work in Puerto Rico.....	90,000	125. Puerto Rico, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins.....	60,592
Source: Stat. 55, p. 663.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 670.	
71. Gatun, additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	200,000	103. Puerto Rico, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including erection of buildings, preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins.....	100,000	126. Puerto Rico, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the benefits of Sec. 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico.....	100,000
Source: Stat. 55, p. 663.		Source: Public Law 129, 78th Cong.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 672.	
72. David, Panama, National Airport, quarters for officer in charge and operators.....	30,000	104. Virgin Islands, for additional amounts for salaries and expenses of the government of the Virgin Islands.....	7,000	127. Panama Canal Zone, for additional amount for salaries, district court, Panama Canal Zone.....	2,250
Source: Stat. 55, p. 663.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 704.	
73. Summit, C. Z., additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	850,000	105. Virgin Islands, for additional amounts for salaries and expenses agricultural experiment stations and vocational school in the Virgin Islands.....	2,100	128. Federal Security Agency, for extending to Puerto Rico vocational education and civilian rehabilitation.....	105,000
Source: Stat. 55, p. 663.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 577.	
74. Puerto Rico, fleet fuel and storage facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	800,000	106. Virgin Islands, for additional amount to defray deficit in the treasury in the municipal government of Saint Croix, because of excess of current expenses over current revenue.....	45,000	129. Loan to Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.....	4,296,664
Source: Stat. 55, p. 664.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.		Source: P. 599, U. S. Treasury Annual Report, fiscal 1942.	
75. Balboa, C. Z., housing for officers and enlisted men, laundry and school facilities.....	600,000	107. Puerto Rican hurricane relief, additional amount for administrative expenses.....	2,400	Total.....	662,806,970
Source: Stat. 55, p. 672.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.			
76. Puerto Rico, Roosevelt Roads (Vieques), additional development of protected fleet anchorage, including acquisition of land.....	21,970,000	108. Virgin Islands government, salaries and expenses.....	12,250		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.			
77. Charlotte Amalie, V. I., additional development of submarine facilities.....	2,195,000	109. Virgin Islands, salaries and expenses of agricultural experiment station and vocational school.....	400		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.			
78. Coco Solo, additional power plant, and shore patrol headquarters and school facilities.....	885,000	110. Puerto Rican hurricane relief, additional amount.....	1,700		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.			
79. Coco Solo, improvement of the water supply.....	26,000	111. Panama Canal and Canal Zone, civil government (War Department).....	111,000		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 132, 78th Cong.			
80. Coco Solo, signal station.....	5,000	112. Virgin Islands, salaries of the Governor and employees, traveling expenses of officers and employees.....	168,820		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 133, 78th Cong.			
81. Coco Solo, improvement of power plant.....	200,000	113. Virgin Islands, for salaries and expenses of the agricultural station and the vocational school in the Virgin Islands, including demonstrations and practical farming.....	37,640		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 133, 78th Cong.			
82. Coco Solo, gas chamber.....	3,000	114. Virgin Islands, for defraying deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix, because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues.....	140,000		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 133, 78th Cong.			
83. Coco Solo, railroad tracks for pier No. 1.....	20,000	115. Puerto Rican hurricane relief, to enable the Secretary of Interior to continue the collection and administration of money due the United States on account of loans made to make compositions and adjustments on loans.....	20,000		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 133, 78th Cong.			
84. Coco Solo, storage for salvage pontoons.....	10,000	116. Puerto Rico, for extending to Puerto Rico vocational education and civilian rehabilitation.....	105,000		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 135, 78th Cong.			
85. Coco Solo, marginal wharf on north side of north mole.....	100,000	117. Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, for work relief in Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, under the supervision of Federal Works Administrator.....	7,000,000		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Public Law 140, 78th Cong.			
86. Balboa, additional ammunition storage facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	165,000	118. Virgin Islands, additional amount for defraying deficit in the treasury of the municipal government for St. Croix, because of excess of current expenses over current revenues.....	10,000		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 242.			
87. Coco Solo, additional ammunition storage facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	160,000	119. Panama Canal Zone, for salaries for officials and employees of District Court of the United States for Panama Canal Zone.....	27,300		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 673.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 502.			
88. Balboa, expansion of hospital facilities.....	250,000	120. Virgin Islands, for salaries of Governor and employees, traveling expenses of officers and employees, and other necessary expense.....	147,980		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 675.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 560.			
89. Charlotte Amalie, V. I., ammunition storage facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	576,000	121. Virgin Islands, for salaries and expenses of the agricultural experiment station and the vocational school in the Virgin Islands, including demonstration in practical farming.....	37,640		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 676.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 560.			
90. San Juan, P. R., additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	752,000	122. Virgin Islands, for defraying the deficit for the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix because of excess of current expenses over current revenue.....	114,800		
Source: Stat. 55, p. 676.		Source: Stat. 56, p. 560.			
91. Balboa, utility building and accessories.....	25,000				
Source: Stat. 55, p. 677.					
92. Charlotte Amalie, V. I., radio facilities including buildings and accessories.....	130,000				
Source: Stat. 55, p. 677.					
93. David, Panama, national airport, quarters for officer-in-charge and operators.....	30,000				
Source: Stat. 55, p. 677.					
94. Gatun, additional radio facilities including buildings and accessories.....	200,000				
Source: Stat. 55, p. 663.					
95. Gatun, additional radio facilities including buildings and accessories.....	200,000				
Source: Stat. 55, p. 678.					
96. Summit, C. Z., additional radio facilities including buildings and accessories.....	350,000				
Source: Stat. 55, p. 678.					
97. Puerto Rico, fleet fuel and storage facilities, including buildings and accessories.....	800,000				
Source: Stat. 55, p. 679.					
98. Canal Zone, temporary housing for marine guards at radio stations.....	60,000				
Source: Stat. 55, p. 679.					
99. Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, work relief on projects in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, under the supervision of the Federal Works Administrator.....	8,000,000				
Source: Public Law 86, 78th Cong.					

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I will say that I have sent for a copy of the speech which the Senator made in connection with his so-called report concerning rubber. I notice that the price per pound has been changed, but that the following language has not been changed:

If this be true, it seems incongruous to permit rubber costs to continue at the rate of \$200 to \$500 per pound in Guatemala, Brazil, and other Latin American countries. The former cost of raw rubber was 6 cents a pound.

The figures of \$200 to \$500 per pound were based on the statement that only 30,000 pounds of raw rubber had been produced.

Mr. BUTLER. That was left out of my official report, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is in the official report as printed, a copy of which is before me.

Mr. BUTLER. In the original report pounds were stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it was pounds.

Mr. BUTLER. And now it is pounds.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is still considered in pounds because by simple calculation the only possible way by which the Senator could arrive at the cost of rubber as being from \$200 to \$500 a pound was for him to use 30,000 pounds of rubber instead of 30,000 long tons of rubber.

Mr. BUTLER. I believe that a few moments ago I explained to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the error was purely mathematical. It had nothing to do with the basic principles of the argument. I believe the good Senator from Tennessee himself will admit that in the past he may have possibly made mistakes in his arithmetic. I have today shown that the figures which he used did not agree with Mr. Rockefeller's figures, and that the figures which he used on the second occasion did not agree with his first figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. They were about entirely different things.

Mr. BUTLER. So far as I am concerned, I am eliminating everything that was said with reference to the Brazilian rubber transaction in the first report, and I am inserting in my report today—

Mr. McKELLAR. A correction?

Mr. BUTLER. My candid and corrected statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

THE REVENUE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the moment, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] does not appear to be in the Chamber, and neither does the majority leader. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is a member of the committee, is present. I wonder if he can give us any information. Our leaders are not present. That is why I make the inquiry.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should be complimented by what the Senator has asked even if our leaders were present.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senate Finance Committee has just very happily reached a complete agreement on a series of amendments to the Senate Finance Committee's recommendation in respect to the renegotiation act.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am intensely interested in that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know the Senator is interested.

Mr. McKELLAR. Being the author of the act I should like to know what the amendments are, if the Senator can tell me.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I believe the Senator will be reasonably pleased with the net result. The amendments are considerable in number, and it is my understanding that it will be impossible to proceed with them this afternoon because it is desired that they be printed so that all Senators may have copies of them before action is taken upon them. I do not wish to presume upon any statement which the able chairman will make.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. However, it is my understanding that he will report the amendments to the Senate this afternoon and ask that they be printed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know that there is on the desk any amendment to the tax provisions of the pending bill that can be pressed at this time or can be disposed of. My recollection is that yesterday all the amendments to the tax provisions had been disposed of insofar as they had been offered from the floor by any Senator.

Now I should like to make this statement: The Senate Finance Committee has given prolonged consideration to the title of the bill dealing with contract renegotiation. The committee has arrived at a conclusion which has the approval of the full committee. It will be necessary to have several amendments printed before the Senate can see clearly and definitely what action has been taken by the committee. I may say that the

amendments agreed to by the committee are not wholly satisfactory, maybe, to individual members of the committee, but there has been a unanimous agreement with perhaps one or two reservations that certain other amendments might be offered from the floor on certain questions that are not material, or, at least highly material.

I, therefore, ask that the amendments agreed upon this morning by the Senate Finance Committee may be printed and placed on the desks of Senators tomorrow morning, and if there are other amendments from the floor to this section of the bill I hope that Senators will see that they are printed and on the desk tomorrow morning. It is not practicable to go into a general statement about the amendments unless Members of the Senate have them before them so that they may see precisely what has been done.

I also ask that these amendments may be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It may not be necessary, but I ask that the drafting service may have until 10 o'clock tonight to file the amendments for the RECORD and for printing and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Georgia is granted.

The amendments submitted by Mr. GEORGE, which were ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

Page 156, line 14, strike out "financial."

Page 158, line 4, before "allowable", insert "estimated to be."

Beginning with line 15, on page 158, strike out down to and including line 2, on page 159, and insert:

"(5) The term 'subcontractor' means—

"(A) Any purchase order or agreement to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any article, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract; or."

Page 165, line 5, after "year", insert "(or such other period as may be fixed by mutual agreement)."

Page 168, in lieu of the committee amendment in lines 2, 3, and 4, strike out "statements," in line 3, and insert "statement."

Page 168, in lieu of the committee amendment in lines 6, 7, and 8, strike out "statements" in line 7 and insert "statement."

Page 169, beginning with line 15, strike out down through line 22 to line 23 and insert:

"(5) (A) Every contractor and subcontractor who holds contracts or subcontracts, to which the provisions of this subsection are applicable, shall, in such form and detail as the Board may by regulations prescribe, file with the Board on or before the first day of the fourth month following the close of the fiscal year, a financial statement setting forth actual costs of production and such other information as the Board may by regulations prescribe. In addition to the statement required under the preceding sentence, every such contractor or subcontractor shall, at such time or times and in such form and detail as the Board may by regulations prescribe, furnish the Board any information, records, or data required by the Board. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement, information, records, or data required of them under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement, information, records, or data."

Page 174, beginning with the comma in line 3, strike out down to and including the

period in line 13 and insert: "The Board may review any determination by any such officer, agency, or division on its own motion, or in its discretion at the request of any contractor or subcontractor aggrieved thereby. Unless the Board upon its own motion initiates a review of such determination within 60 days from the date of such determination, or at the request of the contractor or subcontractor made within 60 days from the date of such determination initiates a review of such determination within 60 days from the date of such request, such determination shall be deemed the determination of the Board."

Beginning in line 25, on page 176, strike out "whether or not such determination is" and insert "which is not"; and beginning with "If", in line 24, on page 177, strike out down to and including the period in line 4, on page 178.

Beginning with line 24, on page 179, strike out down to and including line 4, on page 180, and insert:

"(h) This section shall apply only with respect to profits derived from contracts with the departments and subcontracts which are attributable to performance prior to the termination date. For the purposes of this subsection—

"(1) The profits derived from any contract with a department or subcontract which shall be deemed 'attributable to performance prior to the termination date' shall be those determined by the Board to be equal to the same percentage of the total profits so derived as the percentage of completion of the contract or subcontract prior to the termination date; and

"(2) The term 'termination date' means—

"(A) December 31, 1944; or

"(B) If the President not later than December 1, 1944, finds and by proclamation declares that competitive conditions have not been restored, such date not later than June 30, 1945, as may be specified by the President in such proclamation as the termination date; or

"(C) If the President, not later than June 30, 1945, finds and by proclamation declares that competitive conditions have been restored as of any date within 6 months prior to the issuance of such proclamation, the date as of which the President in such proclamation declares that competitive conditions have been restored;

except that in no event shall the termination date extend beyond the date proclaimed by the President as the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is the earlier."

Beginning with the first "or", in line 23, on page 180, strike out down to and including "harvested", in line 1, on page 181.

On page 182, the committee will ask that the committee amendment in lines 1 and 2 be not agreed to, and on page 184, the committee will ask that the committee amendment in lines 3 to 6 be not agreed to.

Page 182, before line 3, insert:

"(F) Any contract or subcontract for durable machinery, tools, or equipment used in processing an article made or furnished under a contract with a department or subcontract but which is not incorporated in or as a part of such article. For purposes of this subparagraph the term 'durable machinery, tools, or equipment' means machinery, tools, or equipment ordinarily having a useful life of more than 10 years; or."

On page 182, the committee will ask that the committee amendment in lines 6 to 10 be not agreed to.

Page 186, beginning with "the" at the end of line 18, strike out down to and including "and" in line 21, and in line 23, strike out "such act" and insert "the Sixth Supple-

mental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942."

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Am I to understand that any amendment can be filed up until 10 o'clock tonight or merely committee amendments?

Mr. GEORGE. I made the request for the committee amendments both for the RECORD and for the table, so that Senators may have them before them tomorrow when they are taken up and considered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Might I suggest, if it is not inconsistent with the plans of the chairman of the committee, that we might meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., and start going on this job and get behind it?

Mr. GEORGE. That would be entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be entirely agreeable. I think there are no important committee meetings tomorrow morning.

I wish to state that in a little while when the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] returns to the Chamber I wish to have taken up and considered a nomination which has been passed over several times and to dispose of it, but prior to going into executive session I wish to make a brief statement before the legislative session concludes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today marks the third anniversary of the inauguration of President Roosevelt in his present term. His administration has functioned in the interest of the people since March 4, 1933, and we are proud of its accomplishments during those years.

Compare the situation of the United States with that of any other country on the globe, and in the light of such comparison our domestic difficulties may be appraised at their true value.

We are in the midst of a terrible war which was forced upon us and which entails the heart-rending sacrifices incident to such a struggle. The oncoming of the calamity found us ready to meet it, and our arms are victorious in every far-flung theater of action against the greatest military forces the world has known.

We have kept destruction and disaster away from our own cities and, except for the inconveniences of rationing, higher taxes and other regulations and restrictions necessary to war—which are trifling in comparison with the sufferings of other warring nations—and the inevitable sorrows incident to battle casualties, our home life is undisturbed.

Our national prestige is at its peak; our national credit is unassailable. In fact, so excellent is our situation that some of us are engaged in the quadren-

nial diversion of politics, which puzzles and causes wonderment among our allies.

Mr. President, this condition did not come about by accident. We are where we are because we have had an administration, farsighted and conscientious, both in the field of domestic welfare and of grim warfare.

In the final analysis the value of a political party to the Nation is twofold: It must propose a program and it must carry its program into action. Once a definite program has been offered to the people, the party must receive, through an election, the consent of the people to enable it to act. It then acts under the mandate of the people, often in opposition to the policies of the political party not so mandated, and, fortunately, sometimes in harmony with those more reasonable elements of the opposition who have listened to the mandate of the people and are able to rise above party to support action upon programs of unquestioned value to the Nation.

No one would question the fact that we have had political party government in the United States for a century and a half, and no one would doubt the strength and enduring value of our form of government. But at moments in the Nation's history when great problems and questions of vital import cry for solution, as has been the case for the last 11 years, no one questions the necessity of all persons transcending party lines and giving the Nation the soundly progressive legislation needed to assist it through national and international stress and strain and finally to effect its full recovery.

Such legislation by the Congress, and administration thereof by the President, has not only been introduced and supported by the majority party, but a careful check of the records reveals that the minority party has supported some democratic policies and legislative acts of unquestioned value and merit.

The stamina and integrity of a nation are manifested in the character of its laws. The wealth of a nation exists not only in its treasury and its natural resources, but in the contentment and moral character of its people.

The broad, wholesome, and comprehensive laws enacted and administered under the Roosevelt administration have done more to stabilize this country than any other single feature. The Democratic legislative program has infused the strength and resistance into the Nation that have made possible the great victories our military forces have achieved since the treacherous attack at Pearl Harbor. Had the infamy perpetrated by Japan happened in the closing days of the Hoover administration, due to the fact that our military and naval strength not only had not been increased but had been permitted to decline, the onslaught then might have been fatal.

The stimulation of popular legislation beneficial to all the people, expounding the Jeffersonian theory of "the greatest good to the greatest number," has given to this Nation renewed vitality, force, and defensive aggressiveness. Surely there

is no one of rational thought, other than those politically prejudiced, who would ask for the repeal of Democratic national policy-making legislation. Such legislation has been the backbone of the country, and made possible the great resistance recently exhibited in this national emergency.

The Democratic legislative record from 1933 to 1943 has been such as to give stability, energy, and victory to the Nation, economically, financially, and defensively. The soundness of the legislative policies made this Nation an invincible stronghold. The fortitude of the people, and their immediate conversion to a strong, aggressive attitude, were possible only as a result of the wholesomeness of the legislative program enacted under the Democratic administration. This program brought out the splendid national resourcefulness of the Nation.

After President Roosevelt assumed office, before the ringing words of his first inaugural address had ceased echoing through the Nation, his immediate action in declaring a bank holiday inspired the Congress to pass national emergency financial legislation, which resulted in sound banking policies in an unprecedentedly brief time. This action was but a forerunner of the strong financial legislation that was to follow in the months and years to come.

The agricultural legislation that kept the farmer from burning his products for fuel and gave him a profitable return for his labor, the home owner's relief that saved him from eviction and the processes of the sheriff, the remedial legislation that banished the bread line, the heartening legislation that conquered unemployment, the laws that gave relief to labor, the miner, the railroad worker, the industrial employee, all were creations of Jeffersonian-minded legislators. The veterans, servicemen and service-women, have received unprecedented advantages, as evidenced by the long list of laws enacted in their behalf. The industrialists, the capitalists, the laborer and the white-collar worker, the manufacturers—the women and children, the maimed, the halt, and the blind have been given a fairer consideration and definite benefits by the legislation of the Democratic Congresses.

Mr. President, I am appending hereto a brief summary of some of the outstanding legislation enacted by Congress and the Roosevelt administration during the past 11 years. I shall not do more than call attention to it. I have outlined 34 different legislative policies which have been enacted into law during the period of which I speak. I shall not take the time of the Senate to recite them paragraph by paragraph, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be appended to the remarks I have just made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARADE OF PROGRESS—RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT, DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION, 1933-44

1. A sound banking system was inaugurated which was more flexible and responsive to

the needs of the small depositor, investor, or borrower.

2. Federal guaranty of bank deposits and the reopening of closed banks was provided through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Emergency Banking Relief Act.

3. Monetary and financial stabilization was strengthened by passage of the Gold Reserve Act and the Silver Purchase Act. The unsteady position of public finance and credit was corrected by the reciprocal trade agreements, the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, and the Farm Bankruptcy Act, all being major factors in assisting business, municipalities, and farmers to put their finances on a firm basis with renewed confidence.

4. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was organized to save thousands of homes from foreclosures.

5. Farm homes and farms were saved from foreclosures by the establishment of the Farm Credit Administration.

6. Farmers who were vainly laboring to work unprofitable marginal lands were resettled upon new and arable farms and lands throughout the Nation.

7. Electricity, and thus time-saving and labor-saving devices and machinery, was brought to twice as many farms during the 8 years of R. E. A. as had been provided in the last 50 years.

8. A vast program of water conservation has been carried out implemented by the expanded program of dam and reservoir construction. Many marginal farms and unarable lands have thus become arable.

9. Floods, which have always taken an annual toll of millions of dollars from the rural and urban areas alike, have been largely controlled and restrained through operation of the water-conservation program and flood-control acts, such as the Mississippi River Flood Control Act, the Omnibus Flood Control Act, and the Flood Compact Act.

10. Drought-control and drought-relief programs have formed integral parts of all agricultural legislation dealing with conservation. Water-facilities programs provided treatment for more than 3,530,000 acres.

11. The soil-conservation program has returned thousands of depleted and abandoned farms to use. More than 30,000,000 acres have been saved or returned to production.

12. Financial and production aid has been extended to all farmers through the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the farm-mortgage acts.

13. Farm tenancy with its former substandard living conditions has been improved through operations of the farm tenant acts.

14. Encouragement and assistance has been given to the establishment of farm cooperatives effecting reduction in operating and living costs to the farmer and fostering community solidarity and self-reliance.

15. Crop insurance and parity payments have maintained a level of farm prices which have kept farms in production through periods of distress.

16. The natural resources of the Nation have been conserved through the various agricultural programs, and by the establishment of new national parks and monuments. The production of scarce strategic and critical raw materials has been benefited by the financial assistance of the Government to research in synthetic production, this in turn will create new markets for the farms and mines of the Nation while conserving supplies of the natural product.

17. Public-works projects have been carried forward in every section of the Nation in providing work through critical periods and adding to the wealth of the Nation a broad variety of permanent improvements such as roads affording access to remote sections, highways, bridges, dams, and stream control, public buildings, and recreational areas.

18. The Civilian Conservation Corps formed to provide a healthful and normal environment for the unemployed youth of the country carried out a program of road building and reforestation which has added to the future national wealth and the conservation of the Nation's forests.

19. The National Youth Administration aided thousands of underprivileged young people through vocational study programs, direct work programs, and student aid.

20. Old-age and retirement insurance has been provided through the cooperation of the Federal and State governments and industry.

21. Unemployment insurance has given the worker freedom from hunger and fear through periods of industrial stress.

22. The Government in cooperation with the States has given financial aid and vocational training to the crippled and the blind.

23. Funds have been distributed through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to starving and undernourished persons having no other local or private sources of assistance.

24. Slum clearance has given decent housing and encouragement to thousands of underprivileged families.

25. Private home building has been stimulated through the activities of the Federal Housing Administration.

26. Housing projects for new industrial areas have given clean and comfortable quarters to war workers.

27. Legislation has been passed abolishing child labor and its attendant evils.

28. Minimum-wage and maximum-hour legislation have given the worker protection from unscrupulous exploitation—wherever it may have prevailed.

29. The establishment of the National Labor Relations Board has provided a sound and effective means for the settlement of labor disputes.

30. Utility monopolies have been broken providing relief to the consumers from extortionate rates and charges.

31. Legislation was enacted providing for the truth being told to investors in securities, and the Securities and Exchange Commission was set up to protect the investor from corrupt stock exchange and dealer practices wherever met.

32. Reciprocal trade agreements have been made with many cooperating nations effecting a sounder and more mutually prosperous relationship with foreign nations.

33. The good-neighbor policy has brought a closer understanding of the mutual problems and means of solving them to the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

34. Our veterans and men and women on active duty have been aided by increased compensation, greater benefits for their dependents, and job assurance after the war.

The present administration believes that it has brought about a broader conception of human relationships, and a better general understanding of individual and governmental responsibilities. This should point the way to a more sympathetic and cooperative procedure for the solution of future problems. There has come into the hearts and minds of the people a renewed hope and feeling of security against the dangers and hazards implicit in the problem of conversion of a world at war to a world of permanent peace.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1543) to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Don P. Moon, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of November 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED EN BLOC

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the first order of business on the calendar is a nomination in the Marine Corps, which has been passed over several times. I ask unanimous consent that, with the exception of that order, all the other nominations be considered and disposed of en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations, with the exception of the first order, are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE MARINE CORPS—COL. WILLIAM P. T. HILL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. William P. T. Hill to be quartermaster of the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, at the time the nomination of Colonel Hill was first presented to the Senate I raised an objection. I wish now to acknowledge the very gracious courtesy extended me by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. He has always been helpful, courteous, and cooperative, and I wish to assure him that I appreciate his granting me the opportunity to investigate some objections which were filed with me in connection with this nomination.

I do not know Colonel Hill personally, I never heard of him before his nomination was sent to the Senate for confirmation, but at that time a number of objections were presented to me as to why Colonel Hill should not be confirmed at this time, and I think it my duty to lay before the Senate what has been brought to my attention, in spite of the fact that the distinguished majority leader stated what would be the probable outcome of the objections, when he said such nominations have always been confirmed.

In the first place, I do not appear for any official either of the Army or the Navy, but I am speaking today, in these few brief remarks, on behalf of all the commissioned officers of the Army and Navy, the Coast Guard and the Air Force, for throughout their lifetime these men in the armed services have striven for and have endeavored to secure advancement in their ratings. Their entire life objective is to progress in their profession. Men in the armed services are set aside, practically speaking, from all the privileges and opportunities of those in civil life in our country. If anything occurs relative to promotions in these services, their mouths are sealed, and I feel that the matters which have been brought to my attention in the last week should be presented to the Senate for consideration. Perhaps there is nothing in what I shall say concerning Colonel Hill personally, possibly there may be, I do not know, but it is the situation which exists which I think should be taken into consideration by the Naval and Military Affairs Committees of this body as well as the general policy prevailing.

A few days ago the distinguished Senator from Kentucky had placed in the Record a letter from General Holcomb, which, as I recall, was addressed to the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. WALSH). In that letter several statements are made which I do not believe are borne out by the facts in this case. In the first place the statement is made in General Holcomb's letter:

There is but one officer, Brig. Gen. Bennett Puryear, Jr., on the eligible list for appointment as head of the Quartermaster's Department.

Mr. President, I take issue with that statement as not representing the facts, and misleading to the Senate. The facts of the matter are that there are six qualified colonels on the accredited list in the Quartermaster's Department who are entitled by right of seniority, by right of service, and by right of their service records, to be considered in connection with the appointment. I read the names: Col. Arnold W. Jacobsen, of the State of Iowa, now depot quartermaster at San Francisco; Col. Ery M. Spencer, of the Marine Corps, now director of the Quartermaster School at New River, N. C.; Col. William M. Best, of California, now post quartermaster at Quantico; Col. Maurice E. Gregory, now department quartermaster at Philadelphia; and Col. Andrew E. Cressy, of the State of Massachusetts,

now on duty in the southwest Pacific with the Marine Corps.

All those officers are ahead of Colonel Hill in the list for consideration as quartermaster. There are more than 140 colonels of the line, any one of whom could be selected for this important position.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, officers of the various military services are precluded from saying anything. You and I know that if any officer of the Army or of any of the other services raised his voice in one word of protest he would be "broken." That would be the end of his career in the service. He would lose the opportunity for any future advancement. The officers dare not speak, and I am speaking for them today.

Mr. President, let me call attention to another thing. The present quartermaster general is a man named Williams. It is said in General Holcomb's letter, or in one of the other letters which was offered the other day for the record, that it is very important that a decision in this case be made on or before February 1, because General Williams is to relinquish the office by reason of retirement for age at that time, and it is important to have an active officer in charge of the Quartermaster Department.

I wonder if Senators know that the same General Williams, whose place it is so important to fill because of the crisis of war in which we are now engaged, on December 20 took a leave of absence of 40 days as head of the Quartermaster Department and is at the present time in one of the Southern States on a hunting trip, and has been for some time. I see no urgency for passing upon the case if the head of the department, whose marines are fighting all over the world, finds time to quit his post for 40 days and go on a hunting trip.

Mr. President, it must be recognized that the Congress in years past has seen the importance of these selections being made upon some other basis than a personal basis. In accordance therewith Congress enacted a law some years ago creating a commission for the purpose of selecting men from the service for advancement. I do not for a moment contend—and I want the majority leader to appreciate this—that those having the appointive power should be confined simply to the question of seniority. I do not contend for that at all. I do contend that Congress created a commission for the purpose of going over the service records of officers and deciding who are best qualified for advancement or promotion. I hold and believe with all my heart that the fact that an officer's wife plays bridge with the commandant's wife is not a reason for advancing such an officer in any of the armed services of the country. I use that simply as an illustration, not stating it as a fact, because I know nothing about the private lives of these officers or their families. But here we have a case in connection with which General Holcomb makes the statement that in view of the fact that a couple of years ago, because of the war

emergency, Congress said that no appointments other than temporary appointments should be made at this time.

It is . . . impractical to comply—

Note the word "impractical"—

It is . . . impractical to comply—

With the law governing promotions, and, therefore, the promotion must be made upon a personal basis.

Mr. President, I do not agree with that policy at all. Granting that the promotions are now only temporary, I see no reason why the board or the commission which was named and set up by the Congress should not be active at this time and pass upon the service records of the officers presented for nomination to higher grades.

So, in this particular case, instead of some commandant or some superior officer saying, "Here is the man we want," I say that the board should function, and go over the officers' service records, and let the promotion be made upon merit only, and not upon personal choice of higher-ranking officers.

Mr. President, I know it will be said that the contrary practice has prevailed for years. I am not discussing what has been in past years. I am discussing what is fair and right to the officers in these services, and they are entitled to that consideration. They have spent their lives, I repeat, endeavoring to better themselves in their profession. They have spent their lives improving their grades in their profession. If their service records are equal or superior to those of some other officers they should be considered for appointment instead of being thrust aside and kicked out the window by reason of some personal choice. That is the crux of my complaint in this case, and I think it is a sound one, and that the Senate should consider it.

Mr. President, let me now call attention to one promotion recently made, which was confirmed. A certain Colonel Thomas was recently selected by the commandant for promotion to the grade of brigadier general. Colonel Thomas was only a temporary colonel. He was not even in the regular line. He was picked out from 140 other colonels of the line and promoted above 139 of them. No consideration was given to the merit of the other officers, or their service records. Colonel Thomas was picked out because the commandant said he wanted him. I say that is a wrong policy in the armed services of this country and should not be permitted to be continued. If the board which Congress created decides that an officer down the line has better qualifications, I do not have a word to say, and I do not believe any Member of this body would say anything. But I think Senators will agree with me that officers should be picked for promotion on the basis of merit, and not through personal choice of some commanding officer.

I have a copy of a letter before me which illustrates what I have been saying. If I am incorrect in quoting the

letter, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to correct me. The letter states:

I am a marine from Massachusetts, of long service. * * * I cannot sign my name for reason that you can readily understand.

The attached clipping reads that a Colonel Hill has been nominated to be the quartermaster of the Marine Corps.

The Marine Corps has a group of officers who have been designated for quartermaster duty only. It is but proper that the quartermaster should be selected from that group. * * *

Why should six senior officers be passed over so that Colonel Hill * * * be promoted?

These officers are listed in the Navy Register in the following seniority: Brigadier General Long, of California; Colonel Jacobsen, of Iowa; Colonel Spencer, of the United States Marine Corps; Colonel Best, of California; Colonel Gregory, of the Marine Corps; Colonel Cressy, of Massachusetts; and Colonel Hill, of Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I have before me the records, briefly stated, of all those officers, giving a statement of their backgrounds, their education, and their experience. I desire to call attention to the fact that the statement of General Holcomb that only one officer was available for consideration is a misstatement of the facts and is incorrect.

The letter gives a brief statement of the education and background of the various officers. Colonel Cressy, whom I last mentioned, at present is in the southwest Pacific, taking it on the chin with the other marines, not hanging around Washington at a desk job.

Mind you, Mr. President, I desire to repeat and impress upon the Senate that I am speaking for no particular officer. I do not know these men; but I think they are entitled to consideration by the Senate and by the promotion board which handles these matters, and that they are entitled to have their rights and their merits determined on the basis of what their merits are and upon the basis of their service, not upon the basis of seniority alone. I see no reason why the nomination should not be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I am about to move that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs for further study, because, according to the record I have before me, on the particular delegated list there are the names of a number of officers whose service records and whose qualifications are equal or superior to those of Colonel Hill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs for further study of the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I understand that the position of the Senator from South Dakota is not one of personal objection to the nominee under consideration, but that his contention is that the selection should be made on the basis of seniority rather than on the basis of selection as an officer who is judged to be the one best fitted for the position under consideration.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I wish to have my position correctly understood. I said I did not stand upon seniority, but that seniority should be considered by the promotion board in considering the service record.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, one answer to that is that the President made the nomination; no board made it. The President himself sent the nomination to the Senate. I assume he followed the usual procedure of conferring with his Secretary of the Navy, and that the Secretary of the Navy conferred with the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and perhaps some other officers of the Marine Corps, but at least with the Commandant. I assume that the recommendation probably is the recommendation of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, approved by the Secretary of the Navy, and approved by the President himself.

There is nothing objectionable about this officer, so far as his training or his background is concerned. The Senator from South Dakota thinks that, everything else being equal, the senior officer should be selected. I do not think anyone would disagree with him. But those of us who are members of the committee were not in a position to pass on the qualifications of the various officers under consideration. The Naval Affairs Committee had before it only the question of the fitness and capacity of this particular officer for the position under consideration.

The information which comes to me is that the nominee is an exceptionally able and competent officer, one of the very best in the Marine Corps; and there appears to be no objection on the basis of fitness or capacity.

Suppose we should reject the nomination. We would not have anything to do with the selection of the officer whom the President might thereafter select to nominate for the position. The President could select any other officer in the Marine Corps he was pleased to select. He could select an officer of even lower rank than this officer, as has been done in other cases; and in such case we should only be in the position of rejecting the first nominee and requesting that another name be submitted to us. We would not have the right or power to suggest to the President that he select the senior officer, whoever he might be. The Senator has emphasized, and properly so, the importance of recognizing seniority, when it is possible to do so, as a general policy in promotions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator will agree with us, however, from his long experience and his interest in the subject, that promotions to positions of the importance of the one under consideration, at least, and indeed all promotions, should be made on the basis of merit, rather than on the basis of "pull" or some prestige arising from a cause other than merit.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I am sure we all agree to that. There is no evidence, however, that the nomination now before the Senate has been made on the basis of "pull" or influence; but I am sure the Senator is sound in his observation. On the contrary, it appears that Colonel Hill is the marine officer best fitted for this position.

The selective system in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, as I have observed it during the years, operates in a very satisfactory way. It has now been tried out for a number of years. In order that an officer may be promoted from one grade to another, a selective board composed of officers of the next higher grade is selected. The board meets and goes through the records of every officer who may be in the lower rank and who is in a position to be considered for promotion. Those conferences or board meetings are secret. The officers are solemnly sworn to perform their duties conscientiously and without favor or fear, and to make the best possible selection. In my experience, there have come to the attention of the Committee on Naval Affairs only a very few cases of officers who thought they should have been selected and who complained because they were not selected. That is understandable, because we can all understand the delicate position in which an officer who was not selected would find himself if he appealed to a congressional committee to have his qualifications considered, and requested to have stated the reasons why he should be passed over. So I can understand why perhaps very few such cases have come to our attention. None has come to us in recent years. Some years ago there were some cases in which complaints were made against the selective system, but such complaints have not been made in recent years.

The particular position under consideration is not one with respect to which selection is made on the basis of seniority. All chiefs or bureaus in the Navy and in the Marine Corps are selected by the President, I assume after consulting with the Secretary of the Navy. The present nominee is not senior to several other officers.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is it not true that a few years ago the Congress provided for the selection of a promotion board for the very purpose of making recommendations to the President?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Congress itself?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Congress could repeal the present law providing for selective boards. I suppose it could even itself set up a selective board. But the task would be a terrific one, and would involve examining hundreds and in some cases perhaps thousands of records; and it would be simply impossible to remove the influence about which one naturally complains—the possible personal influence or political influence.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again, so as to permit me to make another observation?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I spoke because of the following statement in General Holcomb's letter to the Senator from Massachusetts:

The placing of additional names on the eligible list would require also the selection of additional colonels for permanent promotion to brigadier general of the line of the Marine Corps, since the law vests that function in the Line Selection Board.

That is the board to which I was referring. The Line Selection Board is in existence today, and has been for years.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator is referring to the general selective system?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And not to this nomination?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I did not mean that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As the Senator indicates, the general selective system is composed of a board of superior officers who have presented to them the entire records of the other officers. They may be informed for illustration that there are 10 vacancies, let us say, in a particular rank, and they go through the records of 100 or 200 officers and choose the 10 officers who in their opinion have the best records. They are confined to the records, under their oath, and must very carefully scrutinize the records and make promotions entirely upon merit. So far as I have been able to observe, I must say from my observation that that has been done in a remarkably creditable way.

Only recently the Navy Department has set up a board to provide for the promotions of Reserve officers in the Navy. That board is to consider the records submitted of all the officers in a particular grade who are entitled to promotion, and make selections based upon the best-fitted man, and upon the number of vacancies in the higher grades. That is important. If there are only 10 vacancies in the higher grade, and 100 officers are entitled to promotion, they cannot all be promoted, because the number of officers in any grade is limited by statute. We cannot have an Army of all generals, or a Navy of all admirals. The number of officers in each particular grade is limited by statute.

I must say frankly that the selective system—I am speaking now so far as the Regular Navy is concerned, as distinguished from the Reserve Corps—has worked admirably. In years I have not heard, even privately, with perhaps one or two exceptions, of any dissatisfaction with the system. Many excellent officers are passed over in the selective system, but it is because there are so few vacancies in the higher grades. The number of vacancies is not sufficient to take care of many excellent officers, who must remain in their present grades for a longer period of time.

I was about to refer to the board which has been set up recently to provide for promotions among the Reserve officers,

particularly in the lower grades. That board is charged with the responsibility of reviewing the records of all those officers and making selections for promotions based upon merit. I hope it will work out satisfactorily. Heretofore among officers in the Reserve Corps, promotion has been largely a matter of recommendation from their immediate superior commanding officers, and approval by the Bureau of Personnel. Now a board is to pass upon the fitness, qualifications, and records with respect to all these officers, and promotions from one grade to a higher grade will be made upon the recommendation of this board. The reason for setting up the board is that complaints which have been made that the Department itself, upon individual superior officer's recommendation without surveying the records of all officers, has made some promotions. I am speaking of the Reserve Corps and not the Regular Navy. The Regular Navy prior to the war required all promotions to be made through the selective system to which the Senator has referred. At present they follow the selective system principle but it is no longer a statutory requirement in making temporary promotions during the war.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Was the nomination of Colonel Hill made upon recommendation by the selective board?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not know. I assume not. I assume that the Commandant of the Marine Corps said, "Among the high-ranking officers available to be appointed head of the Quartermaster Corps, this is the best officer. He has had the best experience, and can do this job best."

The Commandant has a responsibility because if this officer is unfit, complaint can be lodged against the Commandant of the Marine Corps for recommending him. Of course, the Commandant of the Marine Corps submits the name of this officer and the names of others, I assume, whom he may think eligible, to the Secretary of the Navy, and later the names go to the President for selection.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will agree with me in this comment upon that situation: Even though the Commandant or commanding officer, whoever he may be, picks out the man he thinks is best fitted because he wants to work with him, this is not any Commandant's personal war, or any officer's personal war. The Senator and I, and everyone else in this country, has a part in this war. We are all partners in it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator is failing to keep in mind that the Chief of Operations of the Navy and his subordinates can send an officer anywhere, any time, to do whatever kind of work it may be necessary to do. That cannot be a matter of seniority.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I understand that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. When an officer is sent to the Pacific to engage in certain naval operations there, he

must be the man best fitted for the task. The Chief of Naval Operations is the one who is responsible. The man who is responsible for the efficiency of the Marine Corps is the Commandant of the Marine Corps. This nominee is his selection. He is not the senior officer. Several other officers are his seniors.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There are six ahead of Colonel Hill.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes; there are some officers senior to him. The Commandant himself was not the senior officer when he was appointed. He was selected by passing over another officer because the President and the Chief of Operations considered that the present Commandant, by reason of his experience in the Pacific, had had special training, was especially fitted, and was in a position to do a very effective and successful job for the Marine Corps. It so happens that in no case is the head of any bureau in the Navy today the senior officer. The heads of bureaus in the Navy Department are selected because of their particular knowledge and experience in a particular line. Take the Bureau of Ordnance. The head of the Bureau of Ordnance ought to be a man who knows ordnance, who has been to the ordnance schools, and has been given special training in ordnance. He should know the subject of ordnance, and all the intricate and involved problems upon which the Ordnance Department must pass.

In my opinion, one of the most capable, if not the most outstanding, officer at the head of any bureau in the Navy Department is Admiral Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. He was not the senior officer, and yet on all sides there is universal praise for the way in which he has accomplished an exacting and difficult task in making contracts and planning for the expansion of our Navy so far as the land establishments are concerned.

So there is no policy in the Navy or the Marine Corps of recognizing the theory that the chief of a bureau should be the senior officer. I think it would be a great mistake if we should attempt to enact legislation requiring that whenever a vacancy occurs in a particular bureau the senior officer must be appointed to the vacancy. I think the vacancy should be filled from among officers in the next lower grade, but I do not think that the man appointed to fill the vacancy should necessarily be the senior officer.

There is another point I want to stress. The promotion to which the Senator refers is a temporary promotion. It is only for 4 years. His appointment as chief of the quartermaster's bureau is for 4 years. This rank goes with the office, not with the man. At the end of 4 years, unless in the meantime there is some change in the situation, he must revert to the grade which he occupies at this time.

I think it would be folly to send this nomination back to the committee. All it could do, at most, would be to reject it, and then the President would send another name to the Senate. The same question might be raised as to the next nominee not being the senior officer, and another rejection might occur if we were

to take the position that the outstanding requirement for a man to be the head of any bureau should be his seniority. I think the Senator will agree on second reflection that that would be an unsound and unwise course for us to pursue.

In view of all the circumstances, Mr. President, I think the motion should be rejected, and that the nomination should be confirmed by the Senate.

Reference has been made to a statement and to a letter which I received from General Holcomb, and which I had inserted in the RECORD a few days ago when the same matter was under consideration. I ask that they again be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Colonel Brown, legal assistant to Lieutenant General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, stated that General Vandegrift considered Colonel Hill the best qualified man in the Marine Corps to perform the duties of quartermaster. Colonel Brown pointed out that General Vandegrift, himself, when he was appointed was not the senior general in the Marine Corps.

As you know, bureau chiefs in the Navy Department and department heads of the Marine Corps are not appointed by seniority, but are appointed from those who are considered best qualified for the particular duties concerned. For example, Commander Moreell, of the Civil Engineer Corps, was appointed a rear admiral and chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and was thus passed over the heads of all the captains and rear admirals in the Civil Engineer Corps, and over the heads of a considerable number of commanders. In a similar manner, every officer who is now a bureau chief in the Navy Department was selected because of special qualifications, and not merely because of seniority.

Confirmation of an officer to fill the post of quartermaster of the Marine Corps is urgent. Unless a person qualifies for this office prior to the 1st of February 1944, the law requires that the Commandant, himself, perform these duties in addition to his other duties.

The rank to which Colonel Hill is being promoted will only continue during the 4 years of his appointment to Chief of the Quartermaster Corps.

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES

MARINE CORPS,

Washington, D. C., December 20, 1943.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to the nomination of Col. William P. T. Hill to be the quartermaster of the Marine Corps, I have to inform you that his appointment is to fill a vacancy in that office which will be created on February 1, 1944, by the retirement for age of the present quartermaster, Maj. Gen. Seth Williams.

The law (U. S. Code, title 34, sec. 667c) provides that as vacancies occur, heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps shall be appointed for 4 years from officers whose names appear on the eligible lists for the respective departments. There is but one officer, Brig. Gen. Bennett Puryear, Jr., on the eligible list for appointment as head of the Quartermaster's Department. He has been hospitalized for the past 5 months, and has appeared before a retiring board which has found him incapacitated for service. In view of the nature of his disability (coronary thrombosis), he will unquestionably be retired.

The placing of additional names on the eligible list would require also the selection of additional colonels for permanent promotion to brigadier general of the line of the Marine Corps, since the law vests that function in the Line Selection Board. However, the act of June 30, 1942 (Public, No. 639, 77th Cong.), suspended permanent promotions for the period of the war, and it is accordingly impracticable to comply at the present time with the regular procedure prescribed in the appointment of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps.

In these circumstances, it appears entirely proper for the President to appoint as head of the Quartermaster's Department of the Marine Corps an officer of the rank of colonel, even though his name be not on the prescribed eligible list.

General Vandegrift, the prospective Commandant of the corps, has recommended the appointment of Colonel Hill, and that recommendation is concurred in by the Secretary of the Navy and myself.

Colonel Hill, who is 48 years of age and has over 26 years' commissioned service, is particularly well qualified for the office. His record throughout his career has been outstanding. As early as 1920, his services were requested because of his special technical knowledge and ability by the Alaskan Coal Commission in connection with a survey of coal fields in Alaska as a source of fuel for the Pacific Fleet. His work there over a period of 2½ years in connection with prospecting and development was of such value as to call forth the commendation of the Secretary of the Interior. He has also had wide practical experience and training in all phases of military procurement and supply, with which he has been almost continuously associated in important and responsible assignments for the past 15 years.

One of his more recent assignments was that of Marine Corps liaison officer in connection with the planning and construction of the marine training camp at New River, N. C. In that capacity he rendered conspicuously valuable service and was to a great degree responsible for the rapidity with which urgently needed housing and training facilities were made available there.

Sincerely yours,

T. HOLCOMB,
Lieutenant General,
United States Marine Corps,
The Commandant,
United States Marine Corps.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, unfortunately for me, I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Massachusetts began his discourse relative to this interesting subject. Since being here, however, I have listened with interest to the observations which the able Senator from Massachusetts has made relating particularly to the nomination of Col. William P. T. Hill, pending before the Senate at the present time.

I do not know Colonel Hill, but I believe it to be my duty to advise the Senate that yesterday a distinguished Representative from North Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM A. BARDEN, came to the Chamber and told me he understood that Colonel Hill's name was coming up for confirmation, and that he would appreciate my giving expression to his views regarding Colonel Hill if I happened to be in the Chamber at the time the nomination was called up. He stated that he had known Colonel Hill for a number of years, that he knew a great many of his military and civilian associates, and that he had never known of a finer man and had never heard of a man in uniform spoken more highly of than

Colonel Hill. I told him I would be glad to report that to the Senate if I happened to be in the Chamber at the time the matter was under consideration. So, having told him I would be glad to convey such a certainly splendid recommendation from one of my colleagues, I am glad now to have the opportunity of doing so.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, what the Senator from North Carolina has said confirms the report which has come to me. I am informed that Colonel Hill is really an outstanding personality and a high-class officer. Let me say that not only did he not seek this appointment but regrets very much that any controversy has arisen over it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have no personal interest in the nomination whatever, except as an American who is interested in insuring that our country shall obtain the best officer material for its armed forces.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] for stating frankly his observation that he does not question Colonel Hill's fitness. He has made a public contribution in emphasizing the importance of a rigid and impartial method of selecting naval officers. I do not think we can emphasize too strongly the importance of keeping in operation the basic principles of the selective system, and the necessity of promotions being based solely upon merit, fitness, and capacity, and the elimination of favoritism and personal and political influence of any and all kinds.

I wish to repeat that, so far as expressions of views on the selecting systems are concerned, I welcome them on this floor, because they have a repercussion in the Navy Department which cannot be other than helpful and beneficial.

I hope the Senator will not press his motion, in view of what has been said, and in view of the fact that the nomination does not relate to the selective system as such.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am exceedingly reluctant not to accept immediately the suggestion of the Senator not to press the motion. I wish to repeat to the Members of the Senate who are present that I do not know Colonel Hill, and never heard of him before his nomination was sent to the Senate. I have no interest in this matter except for the good of the service. So far as the distinguished Senator knows, this nomination was made upon the recommendation of but one man, or possibly two or three men. It was not passed upon by any board, such as the selection board, which has been referred to. The information I have, while not complete, and far from being exhaustive, indicates to me as a layman that there are at least six other colonels on the list who are senior to Colonel Hill, with service records which are at least equal if not superior to that of Colonel Hill, and which should be considered by some board. I do not look at it as does the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, namely, that to reject the nomination would mean merely the rejection of one officer and asking the President to appoint another. If the Naval Affairs

Committee were satisfied, after looking over the records of all the colonels who are available, that one or more of them had qualifications equal or superior to those of this nominee, and make a recommendation or suggestion to those in authority, it would probably correct this situation.

Colonel Hill is fifty-fourth in line of colonels—by the way, he is not the sixth—and it seems very important from the standpoint of the morale of men who have devoted their lives to the service, and who are precluded from taking part in civilian affairs, or protecting or urging their own promotions or qualifications, that the committee should have an opportunity to go over the service records of at least the six colonels who are senior to Colonel Hill. Much as I regret not being able to accept the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I feel that because of the importance of the matter the motion should be pressed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator feel that promotions in the higher ranks of the Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps should be made entirely on the basis of seniority?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at all. The Senator has misunderstood me entirely. Some years ago Congress passed a law creating a selection board for the purpose of examining into the records of military and naval officers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was for advancement in rank; not for the selection of officers.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. This nomination is for advancement in rank. It is to advance a colonel to the rank of brigadier general.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that, but the board to which the Senator refers was set up for the classification of officers into classes, and the advancement of officers in rank.

I may be mistaken, but it is my recollection that before he was appointed to his present duties, General Marshall, who is now Chief of Staff of the Army, was a brigadier general. He was jumped over the heads of 28 of his seniors because the President, the Secretary of War, and the then Chief of Staff regarded him as the best officer in the Army to take over the task which was about to be imposed upon the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not at all contend against the Senator's statement. I simply feel that other officers have a right to have their records considered and studied. According to my understanding, six colonels have been delegated to the Quartermaster Department. Any one of them is equally qualified with the nominee whom we are now considering. I believe that two or three of them are considerably superior to him in their qualifications. I am interested only in a principle. I am not interested in the matter personally. I do not at all contend, as I have said two or three times, that the rule of seniority should control in this matter. I want the officers to be

promoted, as nearly as possible, completely upon the basis of merit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am entirely in sympathy with the proposition of the Senator from South Dakota, but this much is true, that Congress is not really equipped to consider the various qualifications of men for high command in the Army and Navy. We either have to accept the nomination by the President of the United States, or turn it down on the ground that the nominee is obviously unfit. I believe that in the past the Presidents of the United States have done very well in their recommendations of officers for high command. I have opposed some of the nominations because I did not happen to approve the personal qualifications of the nominees. But, unless some Senator can raise objection to the particular qualifications of an officer who is suggested for promotion, it does not seem to me to be within the province of the Senate to try to weigh the qualifications of various officers for high command. It seems to me that that is peculiarly within the purview of the Commander in Chief.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let me ask the Senator a question, if I may. Let us suppose an extreme case where nominations comparable to this are made of men who are obviously unqualified and who are inferior to other men who are qualified, would the Senator take the same position?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have hitherto opposed the confirmation of the nominations of men whom I considered obviously unfit. I will say that the last time I did so mine was the only vote cast against confirmation; but I have opposed the confirmation of men whom I regarded as unfit. I think that is a function of the Congress; but, as between equally meritorious officers, I think the selection is obviously the business of the President of the United States and that, unless there is some vital objection to the qualifications of an officer, it is not the business of the Senate to consider those questions.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think we are pretty much in agreement on that. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

ATTITUDE OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR ON NATIONAL SERVICE LEGISLATION—NOTICE OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I withhold it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. As in legislative session, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, a telegram from Hon. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, dated Miami, Fla., January 19, 1944, embodying a declaration of the American Federation of Labor relative to its position regarding the National Service Act of 1944, which the Military Affairs Committee has now under consideration. At this time I should like to state for the benefit of members of the committee present and the Sen-

ators who are not members that Wednesday last we had with us the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and that, not having completed his testimony or his examination by some of the members of the committee, he was requested to return and appear before the committee with Judge Patterson, his assistant, next Monday morning. That meeting will be held in Room 335 of the Senate Office Building.

There being no objection, the telegram presented by Mr. REYNOLDS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIAMI, FLA., January 19, 1944

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Military Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor now meeting at Miami, Fla., expressed its opposition to the enactment of a National Service Act through the adoption of the following declaration:

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently supported every sound measure designed to win the war in the shortest possible time. Unlike other groups whose opposition to nazism and fascism is of recent and belated origin, the American Federation of Labor from the very beginning vigorously and uncompromisingly denounced totalitarian dictatorship and recognized its basic hostility to democracy. Labor's war against Nazi and Japanese aggression was declared long before Pearl Harbor, and it has been carried on unrelentingly ever since.

"Because speedy victory is its No. 1 objective, the American Federation of Labor has voluntarily submitted to various wartime controls and considerable Government regimentation of vital matters normally left to the sphere of economic determination and collective bargaining—such as terms of employment, working conditions, and wages.

"The one thing the American Federation of Labor has not surrendered and never will surrender is the basic freedom of American workers. Fundamentally, this is a war between freedom and slavery, a war of free workers against slave workers. We believe that in freedom there is strength. The amazing speed with which free American workers have won the battle of war production against the enemy within 2 years upholds the truth of that principle.

"It is now proposed to substitute compulsory labor for our traditional system of free labor through the enactment of a national service law.

"The executive council has given calm and careful consideration to this proposal. We are convinced that it is based on a mistaken premise—the premise that a National Service Act, which would introduce compulsory labor in America, would prevent strikes.

"The experience of other countries—notably Great Britain—proves that a national service law does not prevent strikes. There have been more strikes proportionately in Great Britain in the past 2 years than in the United States. The laws of nature are superior to the laws of man. It is a law of nature that human beings will rebel against injustice. No man-made law will prevent strikes so long as the unjust conditions which provoke strikes are allowed to remain in force. The way to end strikes is to give workers fair play.

"The record shows that the great majority of American workers has remained steadfastly on the job since Pearl Harbor. Are we to punish them and jeopardize the splendid production achievements they have made just because a small minority has proved less dependable?

"Only 2 months ago, the leading representatives of American industry, agriculture, and labor joined in a unanimous declaration that

the Nation's manpower problems can best be solved by voluntary cooperation and that a National Service Act would only obstruct the war-production program. Can we afford to reject this practical counsel and venture into dangerous fields of experimentation at this critical moment in the war effort?

"The executive council firmly believes that the war-production program is progressing far better than anyone could have dared to hope 2 years ago, and should not be upset by radical innovations at this late date.

"We recommend the officers and members of the American Federation of Labor for promptly and vigorously expressing opposition to the proposal for a National Service Act.

"The executive council appeals to Congress to defeat this unnecessary and unwise legislative proposal."

By direction of the executive council:

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
WILLIAM GREEN, *President*,
GEORGE MEANY, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

THE MARINE CORPS—NOMINATION OF COL. WILLIAM P. T. HILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Col. William P. T. Hill, to be quartermaster of the Marine Corps with the rank of brigadier general. Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my request for a call of the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] that the nomination be re-committed to the Committee on Naval Affairs for further study.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Col. William P. T. Hill to be quartermaster of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

As in legislative session,

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1543) to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. MERRITT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. ELSTON of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate

took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 21, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20 (legislative day of January 11), 1944:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Marriner S. Eccles to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Charles T. Fisher, Jr. Howard J. Klossner
Charles B. Henderson Henry A. Mulligan
Sam Husbands

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. William P. T. Hill to be The Quartermaster of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Juanita I. McEwen, Whiteriver.

HAWAII

Francis K. C. Foo, Kailua.

IOWA

W. Forrest McGregor, Corning.
A. Woodruff Moore, Onawa.
Hermann Onken, Tipton.
Mildred L. Thoreen, University Park.

MAINE

Verna G. Clark, Albion.
Lester G. Sands, Bar Mills.
Katherine C. Duntley, Casco.

MISSOURI

Gorda L. Preston, Stockton.

MONTANA

David R. Bowen, Worden.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Harland L. Goodhue, Bristol.
Edward Reilly, Dover.
Walter E. French, Dublin.
Julia W. Blair, Fitzwilliam.
John F. Cronin, Lebanon.
George G. Helsing, New Ipswich.
Ralph E. Avery, West Campton.
Carroll N. Young, West Stewartstown.

PUERTO RICO

Angel Socorro, Caguas.
Thomas S. Gutierrez, San Sebastian.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence R. Dregseth, Baltic.
Alton B. Nelson, Toronto.

TENNESSEE

Mattie Ida O'Brien, Christiana.
Harry B. Gillespie, Limestone.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read an announcement.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1944.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chaplain will offer prayer.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

For our country, for our homes, for the joy of hearts that love, for the privilege to fit our lives to the needs of others, and for all that brings us to Thee, blessed be Thy holy name. O Lord most high. With Thy law written in our hearts, may it be so joyous to obey, that we shall grow into the likeness of Him who came to fill the world with happiness and eternal hope.

Thou who dost permit flame and pain, increase the power of our faith in Thee, keeping watch above Thine own. We beseech Thee to defend us against blindness and fear and lift us into the quietness of that peace which is forever unbroken. Dedicated as we are to our country's weal, remove all confusion; strengthen our wills to do our whole duty and thus inspire our people in heart and soul to dissipate all gloomy forebodings. Thou whose mercy endureth forever, whose righteousness is Thy children's defense, whose voice spake in thunders at Sinai and in whispers to Elijah at Horeb, let the footsteps of a tormenting conscience follow the trails of ignorance and vice in this sunken earth. Give a new, glorious outlook for our Nation; let us labor for its larger life and for the vaster life of humanity. We would unveil our spiritual vision, O Lord, and behold the spirit of our Master resting in mutual service to mankind, rising to a nobler and a diviner civilization. In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, the light of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 470. An act to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation for commercial or other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 184. An act to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908-09.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD in the remarks which I shall make in Committee of the Whole this afternoon certain tables.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. **LAMBERTSON** was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. **MERROW**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times of Wednesday, January 19, 1944, in regard to Winston Churchill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. **LEMKE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. **LEMKE** addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GENERAL MEDINA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Prior to declaring recess, the Chair will appoint as a committee to escort General Medina into the Chamber the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. **RAMSPECK**], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. **MARTIN**], the gentleman from New York [Mr. **BLOOM**], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. **EATON**].

RECESS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. In accordance with the order entered yesterday, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess.)

DURING THE RECESS

At 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m. the committee heretofore appointed by the Speaker pro tempore escorted General Medina to the Chamber, and he took his place on the Speaker's rostrum.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Members of the House of Representatives, it is my extreme pleasure and high privilege to present to you the President of a great people, and our distinguished guest, from the Republic of Venezuela, Gen. Isaias Medina.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF VENEZUELA

General **MEDINA**. Mr. Speaker, filled with the deep sense of American unity I come to this most illustrious rostrum to convey to you—with my voice of a citizen of the Americas—the fraternal greetings of a people proud to have contributed as much as any other, with blood, thoughts, and sacrifices, to establish those principles and realities upon which our continental solidarity stands. I bring to you the most cordial greetings from a people who understands and shares your aspirations, who has fought for them and is ready to support those principles and ideals common to both of us.

I come to you as the head of the Venezuelan democracy, of a country still small in population and development, but large in territory, rich in material resources, great in the loftiness of its principles,

and in its matchless contribution to the history of America. The fatherland of Simon Bolivar is living today one of the most interesting moments of its life. We are now building our future and making for lost time at such a rate and in such a way as to inspire confidence and arouse enthusiasm; and we are doing it while preserving in all their splendor the institutions that guarantee the freedom and the dignity of man and justice as the standard of social and economic life, for our democratic ideal is not limited to words and is not a mere front shaped more or less to impress foreign opinion, but consists of the facts, the realities, the form, and substance of the actual life of a people. Venezuela is a free country where every citizen enjoys civil and political liberty and all the guarantees within the law, and where sovereignty resides in the people and is carried out through suffrage by truly representative municipalities. And so, when the people of Venezuela or its Government state that they are fighting for democracy and cooperating in the victory of democracy, they do nothing else than disclose the real position of a collectivity of human beings who are defending and are ready to defend, not remote ideals, but highly prized possessions which are the reality of their everyday life.

Those principles, that creed, and the geographic vicinity are the determining reasons for the sympathetic feeling that binds us to you. In this august assembly we see the living and fruitful monument to the will of the people who implanted in the history the representative and democratic government. Your example inspired the great men who, with their heroic efforts, built our countries. The cause of justice always found vigorous voices among you, and in the unwithering memory of our gratitude the voice of Henry Clay still resounds pleading for the recognition of our American republics.

No waning and no detriment shall the noble principles suffer that have an altar in this House which is the heart of a great nation. And that is why we come confident, unperturbed by the disparity of our respective powers. We long to live in a world ruled by justice and law, where we can offer reciprocal help, reciprocal respect, and reciprocal trust. Under the beneficent protection of those principles which are the very shelter of the magnificent tree of American solidarity, comes to you today, firm and loyal, the ratification of Venezuela's fraternal friendship. We do not want to be deceived, nor do we want to deceive. In full good faith we serve the cause of democracy and justice which we know is also your cause. We have no concealed intentions. Neither in the past nor in the present have we ever traded with our ideals, and we can state that our adherence and our friendship bear not the slightest shade of a mean interest. We have never asked for anything; we have never accepted anything which we have not fully paid for, and our friendship, on the contrary, brings a considerable material help to the cause for which your own children are offering their lives,

That is why the foundations upon which we approach you are solid and the friendly hand that we stretch out to you is firm.

No wonder that, friends of the past, we are friends of today, for the identity of the ideals that we shared in the past still exists in the present, and the only debts pending between our two countries are those that spring from chivalry, noble deeds, and the fair intentions of our international deals. Our attitude today is the same it ever was. Consequently, from the very moment of the criminal attack on Pearl Harbor, we were at your side. The cause you fight for is the common cause of all democratic peoples. In addition to the powers beyond the seas, the Republics of this Hemisphere are with you, because of their convictions, because of their own interests, because of the defense of their traditions and their future liberty, and in this way they keep their word, given out of their own free will, at a time when nobody knew against whom the first continental aggression would be directed. If Venezuela took your part without hesitation, it certainly was not to offer only the very valuable moral support of an independent people, but also to contribute in an effective way to the collective war effort and to share with you the sufferings and difficulties that, in a greater or lesser degree, necessarily were to be our lot. We have given, and are now giving to you, all we can. Our available raw materials and articles of primary importance are at the command of the United Nations. Our oil, luckily abundant, has reached and will continue to reach the battlefields on the side of the democracies. In addition to our material help, we cooperate with you in the study and coordinated fulfillment of many other common purposes and problems, and our contribution during the recovery period, when the war is over, will be as large and effective as our means may allow, because we realize that in it goes liberty for all, future security, and survival and development of that free life which was the dream of the glorious founders of our nations. My Government has studied with great interest everything that has a bearing on our participation in the common cause, and we are convinced that our attitude and position of today freely permit us to give all that our country's energies are capable of giving.

From Simon Bolivar we inherited the consciousness of American unity, strengthened by the immutable geographic reality and by our common interests and ideals. The present emergency is bringing us even closer together, and you may be sure that it is the whole people of my country who, through me, say to you now: Venezuela is with you today, tomorrow, and always for the sake of justice, for the sake of democracy, for the sake of man's happiness.

At 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m., the committee heretofore appointed, escorted his Excellency, the President of Venezuela, from the Chamber.

AFTER THE RECESS

At 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m., the recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the proceedings that took place during the recess will be printed at that point in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SOUTH AMERICAN AND SPANISH RELATIONS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Evening World of the Scripps-Howard chain, editorially states as follows:

Just when the Axis is threatening to destroy hemisphere solidarity and United States leadership in Latin America, through the Fascist dictatorships of Argentina and Bolivia, press reports from Caracas say the Spanish Embassy there is the center for Axis agents in Venezuela. That is within striking distance of the Panama Canal and of our entire Caribbean defense system.

The Panama Canal and the Caribbean area is the jugular vein of our own defense system. This time the United States must not be caught asleep. The Department of State was caught unprepared for the pro-Axis revolt in Bolivia. At least recognition is being withheld, in cooperation with the friendly Latin American diplomats.

Spain, under encouragement from Franco, is a pipe line of intelligence to Berlin.

In addition I call attention to the fact that Franco still keeps his Blue Division in Russia. We must, as Anthony Eden said in the House of Commons yesterday, pull off the thin veil of neutrality of Franco, the Falange Quisling. Eden said that the British Government could no longer justify to the British people support of a regime that was giving active assistance to Germany against Russia. Spanish troops still in Russia number about 1,500 members of the Blue Division. This barefaced breach of neutrality must stop. El Candillo must be told in no uncertain terms that his soldiers must be returned to Spain from Russia, otherwise Spain shall be deemed foe, not friend. There can no longer be any pussyfooting with Franco. Also our Ambassador to Spain, Mr. Hayes, must be told also that his paens of praise for Franco must cease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired.

RATION TOKENS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from the Director of Price Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by Mr. Sam Cummings, a very prominent New Orleanian.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IN GOD WE TRUST

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the President was hunting around for a new name for his discredited New Deal, it was just too bad that he had to take one from a postage stamp. On this 1-cent stamp we have the "four freedoms." Then on the 3-cent stamp we have "Win the War."

He wants to use the latter as the slogan to supersede the discredited New Deal.

That is kind of hitting below the belt—to grab off those two. Thank God he left us, at least, the one on our hard money, In God We Trust.

I do not need to say there is no one in the New Deal we can trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may have permission to extend his own remarks, and include therein an address which he delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on January 17 I introduced a bill, H. R. 3992, which provides for a simple method whereby those of our armed forces may vote.

The ballot would contain provisions for voting for President, Vice President, Senators, and Congressmen. Under each office to be filled the parties now represented in Congress would be listed and the voter could vote for the party of his choice for each office, or split the ticket if he so desired.

The ballots are to be printed by the War Department and distributed by each branch of the service.

Under this bill it would not be necessary to make application for ballot.

The voter would mail his ballot to his local selective service board and the board would turn all ballots over to the local election officials, where they would be counted according to local election laws.

I believe it impossible to pass a Federal law which would provide a method of voting in the primaries of the 48 States, as the primaries of the different States vary and are held at different times; however, if we do provide a simple method of voting, for those in our armed forces in the general election, for President, Vice President, Senators, and Congressmen, then we have simplified matters for the States who wish to provide for their own soldier voting primary laws, and most of the States have so provided.

Please get a copy of H. R. 3992 and read it, as I intend to introduce it as a substitute for the committee bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

extend my remarks and to include therein two resolutions adopted by aviation organizations, and an editorial from the *Aerial Digest*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *Record*, and include a speech by Mr. Stewart Woodfill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REFUSAL TO PAY INCOME TAX

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a copy of yesterday's *Washington Post*. On page 1, I see the following headline: "Vivien Kellems, war producer, balks at paying income tax."

The first paragraph of the statement reads:

KANSAS CITY, January 18.—Vivien Kellems, Westport, Conn., war industrialist, announced today she had not paid her December 15 income tax, and called upon "all business, both big and small, to follow my example."

Mr. Speaker, for the last 12 months we have been hearing numerous statements in this Chamber about what labor has been doing to sabotage the war effort. Denunciations have been made and investigations have been demanded. It seems to me that worse than any strike is a statement such as this on the part of someone who is making profits out of the war effort. Deliberate refusal to obey the laws of the United States, in wartime especially, is a contemptible action. Miss Kellems, who is stated in the news dispatch to be "one of the outstanding woman industrialists in the country," in 1942 sought the Republican nomination for Congress in the Fourth Connecticut District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, January 25, after the regular business of the House is concluded and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a recent excerpt from the *Marlboro Daily Enterprise*, of Marlboro, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include a newspaper article entitled "The Women of Pennsylvania."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the *Record* and to include therein two short editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IN GOD WE TRUST

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] made a somewhat scornful reference to our Commander in Chief's attempt to awaken us to our primary duty of winning the war and to the "four freedoms," which are the basis of an enduring peace. He also suggested somewhat scornfully that these sentiments are contained on the United States postage stamps. I believe I recall that the faces of such great patriots as George Washington and Abraham Lincoln are also shown on our postage stamps. The only thing I regret is that sentiments such as the President is trying to inculcate in the people are not heard more often in the speeches of the minority membership in Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and the other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE DILEMMA OF PORK PRODUCERS—MARKETING OF HOGS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the farmer who patriotically met the request of our Government and produced more hogs in 1943 than he ever did previously, is now being penalized for that patriotic response to his Nation in time of war.

"Raise more hogs," was the plea of the War Food Administration, "and we will guarantee a certain price per hundred-weight in the markets."

Despite shortage of labor, agriculture met this plea with a production of

millions of additional hogs to take care of our needs and those of our allies.

Bungling by those in control and refusal to see what was sure to happen, temporarily glutted the market and of a necessity the permit system has been invoked. The farmers realize that this is necessary as a cure for the mistakes of last fall and they have patiently waited for their turn to dispose of their hogs.

It is discouraging, however, to these men to be forced on the one hand to hold their hogs so long as to weigh over 300 pounds when marketed and then to be squeezed by the packers when finally able to sell these overweight animals.

The War Food Administration, in refusing to permit the support price of \$13.45 in St. Paul to apply to all weights of butcher hogs, is playing with fire and may wake up out of their bureaucratic idealism some time next summer to find that pork is a very scarce article.

If our Government will not fulfill its announced or implied promises to producers to maintain a cost-of-production floor under hogs—yes, and eggs—it were far better if W. F. A. keeps its mouth shut and makes no such promises at all.

Congress must immediately order W. F. A. to hold the floor under the balance of the 1943 production of hogs unless we want the producers of food in this Nation to lose faith in what Uncle Sam says he will do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain excerpts from a communication.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IN GOD WE TRUST

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman from Michigan should be criticized. I know every Member of this House feels extremely gratified to know that the gentleman from Michigan trusts in something, because we have never seen anybody in authority, whom we have heard him express trust in before.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the *Record*.)

SIMPLIFYING INCOME-TAX FORMS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that the Ways and Means Committee is now studying methods of

simplifying the complicated income-tax forms now required in making returns. It seems that the Department of Internal Revenue should be able to assist materially in this regard.

Under the present system no one can think of filling out a return without hiring an expert. And even the experts, with their slide rules and calculating machines, are troubled. The people want and are entitled to have a system of reporting blanks that will enable the average taxpayer to fill out his own return.

Many people, because of the nature of their businesses, find it difficult to estimate their future incomes, as is now required. In my judgment, that requirement should be modified or repealed. Surely that can be corrected without depriving the Treasury of 1 cent of revenue.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know the Ways and Means Committee is now giving study to these problems. It is hoped that relief will be forthcoming soon.

INCOME TAXES ON MARSHALL FIELD'S INHERITANCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] in the statement that no one should escape the payment of his income taxes now; and for that reason I am going to demand that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue institute proceedings at once to collect the income or inheritance taxes on the \$70,000,000 that Marshall Field came into possession of in September 1943 and on which he is escaping taxes entirely.

I am going to demand that the Attorney General of the United States bring suit for the collection of these taxes and prosecute those proceedings through the Supreme Court of the United States, if necessary.

I know there was an attempt to sidestep the Government and to cheat the United States out of these taxes through a shrewd scheme of some lawyers who prepared the will under which he received this money.

But every dollar of it is subject to the income or inheritance tax now. Instead of using this money to finance that Communist publication known as PM, let him turn it into the Federal Treasury to help finance the winning of this war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, January 21, after the disposition of the business of the day and other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the business of the House today and other special orders I may have 10 minutes in which to explain to these gentlemen why I do not trust the New Deal and why I do trust in the Lord.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the other special orders. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 401 to make in order consideration of House Joint Resolution 192 to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 5]

Baldwin, Md.	Hall,	Morrison, N. C.
Barry	Leonard W.	Mott
Beall	Halleck	Myers
Bell	Hare	Newsome
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Norton
Bradley, Pa.	Hébert	O'Leary
Burchill, N. Y.	Heffernan	O'Toole
Burdick	Hobbs	Pace
Byrne	Hoch	Ploeser
Carlson, Kans.	Hollfield	Plumley
Celler	Howell	Reece, Tenn.
Chipperfield	Jackson	Rivers
Coffe	Johnson, Ward	Robertson
Curley	Jones	Rogers, Calif.
Dickstein	Kearney	Satterfield
Dirksen	Kennedy	Schuetz
Disney	King	Sheridan
Domengaoux	Kleberg	Simpson, Ill.
Elmer	Klein	Smith, W. Va.
Fay	LaFollette	Somers, N. Y.
Fellows	Larcade	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	LeCompte	Taylor
Ford	Luce	Treadway
Fuller	Lynch	Vinson, Ga.
Furlong	McKenzie	Wene
Gamble	Magnuson	West
Gifford	Maloney	Winter
Granger	Marcantonio	Woodrum, Va.
Grant, Ind.	Morrison, La.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). On this roll call 342 Members have answered to their names, a quorum. Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later on yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. The gentleman would not be willing to yield the full hour to me, would he?

Mr. SABATH. If I thought the gentleman would use it for the best interest of the Nation, I would, but of course I cannot assume that.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order Join Resolution 192, known as the U. N. R. R. A., the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The resolution was reported unanimously by the Foreign Affairs Committee after 8 days of careful consideration by the committee, and a request has been made of the Rules Committee for the rule, and that committee, by nearly a unanimous vote, reported out the rule. It is an open rule, and it provides for 2 days of general debate, after which the resolution will be taken up under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SHAFER. That is too much time.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman that there is too much time granted, but that was the request, and notwithstanding what is said here and there by some gentlemen, the Rules Committee always tries to comply with the request of the members of committees who appear before our committee to have a rule granted.

The resolution provides for a contribution of \$1,350,000,000 and no more by the United States. There is the restriction, that it shall not exceed that amount. That amount was arrived at after various conferences on the part of 43 representatives of various nations, of which the United States was the forty-fourth. I shall take it for granted that everybody is in favor of the rule and for the resolution, and so it is not necessary for me to detain the House at length. The resolution aims to provide for millions of unfortunates, men, women, and children, who have been driven from their homes and deprived of all their possessions and are now roaming the countries of Europe from one end to the other. As I say, the amount provided for is restricted, and is based on this, that each of the 44 nations will contribute 1 percent of its national income. As has been stated the amount that will be required, it is estimated, will be between two billion and a half and three billion dollars, which will be provided by the 44 signatories to the agreement. This however will be only 5 percent of the actual cost, it being estimated that the appropriations required later on for proper and complete relief will approximate \$20,000,000,000. I do not have the exact figures but they will be given to you by the very able gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and implemented more thoroughly and specifically explained by the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, who appeared before our committee and made a forceful presentation of the need for this legislation.

Only 1 percent is to be taken from each and every nation of its national income, but notwithstanding that fact, we will contribute more than 50 percent of the original amount because our income is greater than that of all of the other 43 nations, including Great Britain and

every one of the member nations that signed this agreement.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MASON. According to the report it is 1 percent of the income of those nations who are in this agreement who have not had their homelands overrun. That brings us down to only about half a dozen nations, because most of them have been overrun and occupied by the enemy.

Mr. SABATH. Those small nations, of course, will bring it to more than six nations, because the sovereign republics have not been overrun and many others have not been overrun. But naturally those that have been overrun have no income and they cannot guarantee or assure a contribution to this great humanitarian relief. The point I want to make is this. Though the amount is great, still it shows how prosperous, how rich our Nation is, when our income is greater than the income of all the 43 nations that have subscribed to this agreement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If a nation has been bombed and its cities heavily bombed, but no soldiers have invaded it, has that nation been overrun by the enemy?

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does this bill define that so we will understand that?

Mr. SABATH. I will say this, I do not desire to deprive the chairman and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that diligently and painstakingly devoted so much time and gave the matter such thorough consideration the opportunity to explain the bill more effectively and intelligently, because they have considered it for many months, not only during the time that the bill was being considered in the Committee on Foreign Affairs but long before. Conferences have been held by the Senate committee and by the House committee in conjunction with the State Department and other departments, and finally agreement entered into originally, I think, in the White House, and later on concurred in, and the agreement finally drafted and agreed to by the 44 signatory nations in Atlantic City several months ago. The agreement in its entirety is embodied in the resolution now before us and speaks for itself.

So I am giving you the rough outline of what this bill aims to do. I know that there are some gentlemen who feel that the cost to the Government will be great. But let me say that it will not be a great cost to the Government in the long run. Our Nation will be the beneficiary, because all these nations and these peoples that we are going to aid and assist will recognize and appreciate our effort and our aid to them. At this time I am reminded of a \$20,000,000 contribution that we made, I think it was in 1920 or 1921, upon the request of former President Hoover, then in charge of American relief, who urged help for the Russian people in certain sections that had suffered severely from drought. At that time

many people thought it was unwise and that we should not appropriate that sum of money, but later on, after we had acted and passed the resolution authorizing the amount and started to purchase wheat and corn and other articles, within no time at all the price of those farm products and everything else had gone up so that the country really had been benefited to a greater degree than the amount we provided for. I am satisfied that in this case again the United States will be benefited notwithstanding we are going to advance this amount of money for this needed humanitarian purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to ask the gentleman whether the agreement which appears in this resolution in quotes does or does not become a part of this resolution in the sense that it is Federal legislation?

Mr. SABATH. I think it does. But it also provides, that is, the very agreement you call attention to, that any country has a right at any time, that is, not "at any time," but after due notice, to withdraw. Furthermore, the agreement cannot be changed or altered if there is any objection upon the part of any one nation that might be dissatisfied with any provisions that might apply to it, or any acts of the committee that will have charge of the distribution of this relief. I hope I have answered your question. I will say this to you. The gentleman sitting right next to you, the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dr. EATON, is so well posted and informed in the matter that I know if he will take the floor he can, as I have stated before, more thoroughly and intelligently explain the various provisions of this important bill than I possibly can, as my time has been limited in the study of its provisions.

And that applies to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], Republican members of the committee, and naturally as well as to the chairman of the committee [Mr. BLOOM], and Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas, all of whom appeared before the Committee on Rules and impressed the committee with the splendid work on their part and the careful consideration they had given to this important matter before they finally came to the conclusion to report the bill to the House and to ask for the rule. I shall conclude, but before I do so, I feel that it is my duty to express my appreciation to the splendid Committee on Foreign Affairs for its wonderful work, and the time and devotion they have given to this legislation which I know is of such great importance to millions of unfortunate men, women, and children, many of whom have been deprived of everything they ever possessed and who are roving the countries of Europe half starved, without food or shelter.

I feel it is not necessary for me to call attention to the plight of millions of Poles, Yugoslavs, French, Belgians, Greeks, Hollanders, and the peoples of

the smaller countries, saying nothing of the outrageous atrocities practiced on them and, especially, on the Jewish people, believing that is generally known and recognized by all of us. Never in the history of the world has the need for relief been so great as in this instance. Therefore, I feel that we should provide those who have escaped the murderous hands of the Nazi and who are half-starving and suffering tortures beyond description, should have sufficient food, clothing, medical care, and, yes, shelter. Any help that will alleviate their suffering will be repaid tenfold. It will serve to prevent future hardships and will bring about their rehabilitation in all of the over-ridden countries and make them self-sustaining in the shortest possible time and will, most definitely bring order out of chaos. This legislation aims to bring relief to them and I, therefore, feel that the rule should be adopted by unanimous vote and I hope that the bill also will receive the unanimous vote of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, reserving the balance of my time, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. I yield 10 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat depressed by the fact that this legislation is presented to this body at a time when there seems to be widespread misunderstanding, suspicion, and anxiety as to its provisions, as to its origin, and as to its purpose. I may say that in 20 years I have never seen a bill come from our committee, on which I am proud to serve, that has received such continuous and careful consideration as this bill.

We have written a report which is both exhaustive and exhausting, setting forth the background of our efforts to produce legislation which, I am sure, will eventually meet the moral sanction and intellectual approval of the rank and file of this House on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, in a sentence or two I want to give the reason for this legislation. You must know that when final victory comes to our armies there will be great sections of Europe and the Orient that will be completely devastated and destroyed. We will have, and we have now, in Europe 20,000,000 people who are scattered away from their homes. Eight million of them have been taken into Germany, many of them for slave labor. Many of those people are homeless women and children who for long years have had no proper nourishment, no proper shelter, no proper clothing, and who are in an emaciated condition that augurs ill for their future and the future of their descendants.

So that as we view the picture in Europe, and in China, and in other occupied territories, we discover a tremendous appeal to the humanity and to the self-preservation and intelligence of every free nation in the world, including our own. For, Mr. Speaker, we might as well face the fact, that after this war is over we shall be faced with problems of reconstruction, problems of assistance, problems of developing our own re-

sources, and our own safety that will tax our legislative power, our statesmanship and manhood to the last degree. It will not be a question of Democrats or Republicans. Certainly it will not be a question, I hope, of the New Deal. It will be a question of the American people and the other free peoples who will seek to save themselves by helping to save the rest of the world, which will be in instant and complete contact with them.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for this Nation to continue in an orderly way in a disorderly and chaotic world. It is impossible for us to continue to be an island of prosperity in an ocean of adversity. It is impossible for us to continue in peace and security, surrounded by a world in economic and social chaos. It is impossible for us to retain or sustain our national life separate and distinct from the rest of the world. We cannot be a healthy Nation surrounded by a sick world. In self-defense apart from all other considerations our first duty is to help the sick and needy in war-stricken countries to rehabilitate themselves.

The object of this legislation expressed in one sentence—and do not forget it—is to help those people to help themselves. At this point I shall refer to the money part of the problem.

It has been continuously stated that we are going to pay 50 percent of all the expense. The fact is, which I will demonstrate in a minute, that we will pay about 5 or 6 percent, because the complete contribution that will be made through U. N. R. A. will be something over \$2,000,000,000, including our large share, which will be 50 percent of that; but the nations that we will help to help themselves will, out of their own resources that have not been destroyed by the enemy, put up 90 percent of the total cost, making the expenditure finally amount to about \$20,000,000,000, 10 percent of which will come out of the 44 nations, including ourselves.

Those are the facts of the situation.

Secondly, what does this bill provide? I ask my colleagues to turn to page 2 of the bill. The first paragraph provides:

Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings—food, clothing, and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence—

If you have a million people over there who are ill and underfed and they start a trek back home carrying typhus or smallpox, you have to prevent that plague from spreading over the Continent in order to protect ourselves from the infection—

and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes and for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services.

Now, I want to give you the history of this legislation.

In 1941, before Pearl Harbor, before we were in the war, the Allied countries

met in London and faced this very problem. They appointed a commission or a committee to study it. That committee had no organization, no money, no executive; but it gave study to the facts. After we were in the war a while it dawned upon us, as it already had upon Great Britain and Russia, that this was inadequate to meet the situation, and at the suggestion of Russia and the United States, a further study was undertaken on behalf of all the Allied and associated nations, 44 of us. That study continued from sometime in 1942 until this final legislation came from our committee. That study was carried on in complete accord and understanding with the representative committees of both branches of this Congress. Our Committee on Foreign Affairs had the executive representatives before us continuously, bringing the various drafts of the organization to us for our consideration. Over in the other body the Foreign Relations Committee appointed a subcommittee, representing all conditions of opinion—Senator VANDENBERG, Senator GREEN, Senator LA FOLLETTE, and two or three others. They cooperated with the executive authorities of the State Department and with foreign representatives in drafting this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Illinois for giving me this reprieve.

We had this continuous consultation, representing our House, representing the Senate, representing the State Department, and representing our allies—Russia, Great Britain, and China. At last this plan of organization of 44 nations was evolved. Then the question was: How much shall each contribute? After complete study at Atlantic City it was decided that the least objectionable, although it is fraught with many objections, the least objectionable solution of the problem was to make it 1 percent of the national income for that particular year 1943.

This bill does not provide for reconstruction; it is not a world W. P. A.; it has nothing to do with the announced objectives of the New Deal, very many of which would make everybody rich by making everybody poor. It has only one program, and that is to relieve the danger to the liberties and prosperity of the United States and the other free peoples resulting from the distress, failure, and ruin in these occupied countries due to the war. This legislation represents a study as fair and complete and courageous as that given to any legislation I can recall in 20 years. It is not a fly-by-night proposition. We had before our committee the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]. In my judgment, he is one of the best equipped and ablest men on economic questions in this country. He had a bill which I consider of the utmost importance to deal with the problem of reconstruction. He, like the rest of us, was entirely in

favor of relief of the distress, hunger, disease of our fellow mortals in these stricken countries, but he did not want, and we do not want, and I do not want, and you do not want, the United States to go in haphazard and scatter its money to the four winds to rebuild the physical institutions of these shattered countries.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] proposes in a bill which he is now rewriting, a system or method by which the United States can on a business basis associate itself with enterprises that look to the reconstruction of the shattered utilities and other services of the Old World and the Orient. Mr. Speaker, before we are through we are going to be doing business in every part of the world and our chief problem will be to keep what belongs to us and to assist in making the world prosperous in order that the flood of prosperity may come back upon us.

I want to say just one more word. I pray that we can approach the consideration of this bill calmly; denude our minds of suspicions and fears which are perfectly justified under many conditions that exist in this country.

We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that this House passed the Fulbright resolution which enabled this part of the Congress to go on record in favor of our cooperating as a Nation in the rehabilitation of the world, and for the securing of safety in the generations to come by means of an established peace. We do not forget that the Senate passed a similar resolution broad in its scope; and you Republicans do not forget that up at Mackinac Island you produced what we called the Mackinac charter. This resolution is as absolutely in accord with the principles of those three resolutions as any instrument can be from any point of view; so I hope this debate will throw light and not heat on the question and that all of us may find a rational basis upon which to vote favorably upon its final consideration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. With pleasure.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that it was necessary to include the agreement signed by the 44 nations as a part of the resolution?

Mr. EATON. I regret to say that I was not the author of that suggestion. That suggestion was made by a distinguished Republican Senator, named VANDENBERG, from Michigan, Mr. HOFFMAN's State; and in accord with his views and the views of his colleagues we thought it was good to put that in simply for information and not for legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But after all it is much more than information; it is legislating the agreement.

Mr. EATON. I am not under any bonds to accept the gentlewoman's interpretation.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. By including the agreement and nothing else we show just exactly what Congress approves and what they do not approve. In this way we are not taking a pig in a poke or describing something that is not before the body; is not that true?

Mr. EATON. Answering the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Ohio, and the gentleman from Minnesota, let me say that I did not make the suggestion to the committee. Had I been consulted by those of the upper levels in legislation I would have thought it an excellent idea to print in this legislation exactly the thing we were implementing in meeting the needs of the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Yes; I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that the agreement was read to the entire Foreign Affairs Committee last summer long before it was ever presented to any other nation or any other person? It was presented to the Foreign Relations Committee; it was presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee by a representative of the State Department, and at that time it was considered that we should place the agreement in the resolution as suggested by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. EATON. Yes; that is right.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. In answer to the suggestion made concerning the inquiry as to whether or not by incorporating the terms of the agreement in the bill such act constitutes ratification of the agreement, I do not agree that it does. I think this bill does one thing and one thing only. On the first page of the bill and on the last page are the only legislative portions. The bill merely authorizes our Government to participate in this organization by expenditure of money; and then in order that we may know what the organization is we say that the agreement constituting that organization is as follows, thus setting it out so the Congress may know what the purpose of the organization is.

As far as ratification is concerned, the adoption of this resolution will not ratify the agreement, will not change it if we may want to change it but merely states that this is the agreement. The only thing the resolution authorizes is the making of appropriations hereafter for support of that organization.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Conceding the nobility of purpose of the proponents of this legislation, does the gentleman think just because the purposes are noble that we have any right to circumvent the Constitution, to bypass the Constitution and by legislation avoid the provisions of the Constitution which so plainly provide that the President shall have power—and this is the only place where power is conferred upon the President in matters of this sort—that the President shall

have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties providing two-thirds of the Senate concur. The point I have in mind is: Why has this agreement not been submitted to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. My answer to that is that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate examined this with great care and decided that it was an Executive agreement and not a treaty, and therefore would not necessarily come before the Senate for ratification, for consent and approval.

Mr. GEARHART. Before this New Deal administration came in there was a very, very narrow view placed upon the right of the President to negotiate Executive agreements. Since this administration has been in power it has been increasingly widening the field, until now it is contended by New Deal internationalists that you can do anything by Executive agreement which in the old days everyone thought had to be done by treaty. Are we accepting and ratifying this new view being set forth, this so-called Executive agreement which is nothing but a treaty? It does not make any difference what you call it. All agreements or conventions or covenants or treaties or Executive agreements are all the same thing. Are we, by putting that in this bill, giving encouragement to this administration to go on and on and on, until finally they get sufficient courage to negotiate a peace treaty under the guise and in the form of an Executive agreement? We have taken a constitutional oath to defend the Constitution of the United States. When are we going to begin to do that?

Mr. EATON. The gentleman has made a very pertinent and eloquent defense of the Constitution and the right and duty of the Senate to consent and approve of a treaty, and I hope that when he gets in the Senate his voice will be heard as distinctly and as authoritatively as it is here. But that is not in our bailiwick here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that the Senate wishes to have this agreement in the bill in order to give it legislative sanction.

Mr. EATON. That was not my understanding.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That was the general understanding—that we would give it legislative sanction by a majority vote.

Mr. EATON. Is the logic of the lady's position, then, that we ought to reject this bill and let the Senate wrestle with it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we can accept the appropriation part and leave out some of the rest of it, or amend it.

Mr. EATON. That is what we are doing.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. On page 10 I find the following provision:

Foreign voluntary relief agencies may not engage in activity in any area receiving relief from the Administration without the consent and unless subject to the regulation of the Director General.

Would the words "foreign voluntary relief agencies" include the Red Cross, the various missionary boards of our churches of all denominations, or what does the gentleman mean by that provision?

Mr. EATON. It means exactly what it says, that U. N. R. R. A. has one definite objective, namely, to feed, clothe, medicate, and, where necessary, to put temporary shelter over the stricken peoples of Europe until they can get started to produce for themselves.

Mr. CURTIS. One further question to clarify that. In other words, if U. N. R. R. A. found that a certain country shall not receive relief or shall receive very little, they can prevent the American Red Cross or any other agency from distributing medicine, food, or other charitable items there?

Mr. EATON. Not under this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think you have been looking at the world through rose-colored glasses.

Millions of Europeans, not only in Poland but all over Europe, will fight to the death rather than be ruled by either Stalin or Hitler. Because they believe Hitler is already doomed to defeat, because they believe Stalin will be the next dictator of Europe, they are beginning to fight Stalin. Thus the Moscow Agreement, because it will help Stalin become dictator of Europe and encourage freedom-loving Europeans to try to prevent it, was a victory for the Axis. Because this U. N. R. R. A. measure will also help Stalin become dictator of Europe and alienate European allies it will, if passed, be another victory for the Axis.

America's contribution—nobody pretends this will be the last contribution—will be \$1,350,000,000—more than a tenth of what Americans usually pay in Federal taxes. At least 60 percent of the money is to be paid for by America—private contributions by Americans will not even be counted in as part of America's 60 percent. The rest of the contributions, if and when made, will be paid mostly by nations to which America has already donated more money than these nations will contribute. Article V of the measure seems to preserve America's constitutional rights. But section VIII gives U. N. R. R. A. the right to amend that

article and take away American constitutional rights without American consent—since only a two-thirds vote of the associated nations is required to do so.

U. N. R. R. A. is to have a monopoly on all the food supplies of the world. U. N. R. R. A. can give supplies where needed or refuse them—even though the nation wanting them has and offers the money with which to pay for the supplies. U. N. R. R. A. has the right to levy on American supplies and cause American citizens more shortages and more rationing. America has no veto power to prevent it. Mr. Crowley admitted on cross-examination by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] that America has no veto power to prevent it.

The recognized government of each nation is to be given the right to distribute supplies allotted by U. N. R. R. A. to that nation. The government so enriched will be permitted to sell instead of giving away supplies to its people and pocket the money in a revolving fund. If it chooses to use that revolving fund for purposes other than relief purposes U. N. R. R. A. has no power to prevent it—except the right to refuse further supplies.

And who do you think will control the recognized governments of Europe which will control the distribution of supplies in each European country? Stalin.

The Moscow Agreement, you remember, provided that the first Ally to reach a liberated country has the right to occupy that country and hold an election to determine who shall control the government. Stalin will be the first Ally to reach most every country. Stalin with his army will hold the elections. Stalin will use his army to win the elections the way Hitler did it in Austria and Stalin himself did it in east Poland. Stalin has political machines already set up to win the elections in most every European country. Thus Stalin can use U. N. R. R. A. money to make himself dictator of Europe and keep himself dictator of Europe. The fact that millions of Europeans know it and will fight to prevent it makes this measure another victory for the Axis. It is not kind to the people of Russia to help their ambitious leader Stalin acquire so much power that people who should be fighting with us want to help Hitler in order to prevent Stalin having as much power over Europe as Hitler had.

This money will not be paid for by you or your generation. It will be paid by veterans and the children of veterans, many of whom have already made the supreme sacrifice for the civilians of Europe.

The safe, sane, constitutional, and Christian way to relieve the victims of Nazi barbarism is to organize a tremendous drive for voluntary contributions to be paid for by Americans of our generation, many of whom have war-swollen fortunes. Let it be distributed by the Red Cross, the Quakers, and other practical, nonpolitical organizations.

There is no law to prevent you or any other American citizen giving everything you possess to this cause. But you in Congress have not this constitutional au-

thority. Federal contributions to foreign countries have been made in the past, but the sums were so small we winked at the practice. Congress has no constitutional authority to force Americans of this or any other generation to give money to people outside of America.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from Illinois, who expressed to the House in such eloquent terms her strong feelings about this bill from a strictly American point of view. Thank God, there are those in this legislature that still use that one yardstick, what is best for America, and know nothing else different.

I admire Winston Churchill, I admire even Joe Stalin, the leader of communism, for one thing. First, I admire Winston Churchill, I may say, because he always puts the interest of the British Empire first, and Joe Stalin always puts the interest of the Communists first. The gentlewoman expressed her views.

Mr. EATON. I refuse to be accused of being disloyal here. I am as good an American as is the gentleman or any of his breed. I want him to understand that.

Mr. FISH. I will reach the gentleman in due time.

I repeat my statement that the gentlewoman from Illinois, using that one yardstick, what is best for America, gave her views. She is entitled to her views and the gentleman is entitled to his.

Mr. EATON. She is; and so am I.

Mr. FISH. I do not believe that in this vital issue there should be either partisanship or rancor but if we cannot say that a Member of this House is entitled to express her views the same as other people have in other nations, using that one yardstick, what is best for America, then there is something wrong about free speech in America. That is all she did. I am not criticizing anybody opposed to this bill because I may vote for this bill myself. If it is amended, I may vote for this bill myself. I voted it out of the Committee on Rules because I believed it should be considered in the House and substantially amended.

I do not agree with the gentlewoman who spoke to this extent. I think the time of the Congress has come—and I agree there is involved a debatable constitutional question, but I am ready to vote to feed these millions, to clothe them, to give them medical supplies and fuel, but I am not ready to vote for this bill, which includes rehabilitation, the building of factories, and public utilities. Why should we spend \$1 of American money to build any factory in Europe, to be owned by whom?

When the gentleman from the Committee on Foreign Affairs appeared before the Committee on Rules, I asked him, "What does this rehabilitation mean?" He said, "It means that we can build factories in these foreign nations." I said, "What kind of factories?" He said, "Textile factories." Imagine using American money to build textile factories in Europe.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. No; I have only 12 minutes and I must continue, because I have a good deal to say.

Mr. SABATH. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would state the name.

Mr. FISH. I do not want to name any names here. It was a distinguished gentleman of the committee, who specifically said textile factories, that you can build textile factories, you can build steel mills, you can build glass factories, or any other kind of factories.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I will not yield, I am sorry to say.

Mr. BLOOM. I just want to get it right, that is all. The gentleman is making a misstatement.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman says I am making a misstatement, I will name the man, and he is in this room. If the gentleman, who is in this room, will permit me to do so, I will name him. It is in the record. He said it permitted them to build textile factories, not just plain factories, but textile factories.

Mr. BLOOM. Did he say it permitted them to repair them?

Mr. FISH. No, to build, repair, and everything else.

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. FISH. How can you repair them when they do not exist?

All right, rehabilitate them. Rehabilitate the textile mills. I will not quibble about the words. That is what I am opposed to in this bill. I realize the constitutional issue is a grave and a serious one, but I am not opposed to relieving the suffering of the starving people of Europe and of the liberated countries with the necessities of life, but not one bit beyond that. I am not willing to spend a single penny of American money for glorified W. P. A.'s, and certainly it becomes a world-wide, glorified W. P. A., despite the denial made here by the gentleman from New Jersey. The minute you go into rehabilitation it can be nothing else. When we had our W. P. A. here in America we did not go out and build or rehabilitate factories. It was a question of unemployment. They even take that up in this bill.

Let me read to you the parts to which we are opposed. I am not speaking here as an individual on this matter. I know three members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who will offer vital amendments to this bill. I know of other amendments that will be offered. Let us consider some of those amendments.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. Rogers], one of the senior members of the committee, will offer an amendment to prohibit any of this money being used for educational purposes. Certainly that prohibition ought to be in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a very brief question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, it would not be even our ideology that would be taught, it would not be our

education taught to the people of these countries, but the beliefs of others.

Mr. FISH. It would be dictatorial and possibly communistic.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We are fighting, I think, so that people may have their own form of education and their own form of religion.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] will offer an amendment to include starving and disease-stricken India.

If any nation ought to be included, where hundreds of thousands have starved to death within the last few months, certainly India ought to be included, and India contributes, or may contribute; and when we come to that matter of contribution, let us get the facts correct. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] kept talking about 50 percent of our contribution. Our contribution is 60 percent, and we are called upon right here to authorize the entire total of \$1,350,000,000, or 60 percent of two and a half billion dollars, the total sum required. We have no guarantee that these other nations will pay, but we are called upon in this bill to authorize the appropriation of the entire lump sum, whereas we have no guarantee that many and many of these nations, will pay, and many will not pay. I shall not go into that now, but that is a matter of record.

A member of the committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER], will offer that amendment to reduce the amount to \$675,000,000, or one-half the sum carried in this bill. I would prefer to have it reduced to \$500,000,000; but he is a member of the committee and will offer that amendment. I shall offer an amendment myself requiring that 90 percent of all of the moneys that we appropriate be expended for supplies in this country; that 90 percent be spent here. I wish I could agree with my distinguished friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] when he talks about this great ocean of prosperity. Can he guarantee that there will be oceans of prosperity in this Nation after the war, when 10,000,000 soldiers will come back home looking for jobs? There will be millions. I do not know a single industry in America that will not cut down almost one-half of what are employed today. Unquestionably, there will be 20,000,000 unemployed, and there will be no ocean of prosperity. Yet, we are called upon here to authorize \$1,350,000,000, part of which is to go to rehabilitation in foreign lands, the building of public utilities and factories and other buildings.

Gentlemen, that is the issue before you, not so much a matter of relief. I know that some of you will not oppose matters of relief. We all remember when Mr. Hoover spent \$100,000,000 for the relief of 10,000,000 Belgian people. That contribution came from private funds, and that was successful. Twenty years ago I got through a bill in this House for \$10,000,000 to feed the starving people in central Europe. I introduced 2 years ago and again last May a bill to feed them now, and I believe in

it with all my heart. I believe in feeding the starving children of France and Belgium and Norway and all of the other occupied countries.

I do believe we owe a moral duty to supply funds, but also we owe a moral duty to serve notice on the British Empire to let food ships go through the blockade into France and Belgium and Norway and Holland. And so I am willing now to afford relief. What I want is to see this bill amended by the Congress in the regular way and after full and due consideration. There will be, and I am glad to say that I am a party to providing for it, 2 days of general debate on this bill. It is one of the most important policy bills that has come before the Congress, one of the most important peace bills. It should be considered on a nonpartisan basis, on an American basis, from the point of view of what is best for America. That is the only yardstick that should be considered here when we vote on each and every separate amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Back in 1933, when we had been here but a few days, there was brought into the House an economy measure, and at that time we had a national debt of less than \$25,000,000,000. That measure applied to disabled veterans, and at that particular time it was advocated by Members who now, with a debt of \$200,000,000,000, would grant the sum of \$1,350,000,000. At that time they wanted to reduce the veterans' income, with a debt of \$20,000,000,000 and claimed that if we did not that insolvency threatened the country and that the credit of the country would be reduced to a chaotic condition. Yet these gentlemen now seem to be the most willing to vote to spend this money, when we have a debt of \$200,000,000,000. Yet, as I say in 1933 they were the most anxious to cut down the veterans' income, with a national debt of \$20,000,000,000 and take it away from the soldiers.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will have to ask that question of those who voted against the disabled soldiers at that time. Of course, the question of taxes is a vital one, and we are now approaching a debt of \$200,000,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield those 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible for anyone within 2 minutes to answer the misstatements and misconceptions of what this resolution is, as stated by those who have spoken in opposition to it. This is a war measure. It is just as important for the winning of this war as the appropriations that we have made to the War and Navy Departments. It is a war measure because it does what we had to do at the close of the last war in afford-

ing relief, immediately after hostilities ceased. When an occupied country is liberated there will immediately arise the question with reference to relief of people in those countries, where the food has been stolen, where people have been taken away by the Axis Powers. Disease will follow, and this appropriation, when it is made, will help not only those people of the liberated countries, but it will help our soldiers over there, who would be subject to diseases that may be prevalent. I hope that we are learning some of the lessons from the last war. At the end of the last war we had to do the work being done now, but instead of having an agreement in advance, we made no preparation for it, and we had to do it after the war was over. As a result, it cost the United States over \$3,000,000,000. This time we are planning to cooperate with the other countries of Europe, whereby they will contribute to the funds, and whereby the funds will be wisely administered to reach the most effective means of doing what this legislation is designed to do. I submit that when this House understands all the facts back of this resolution no one, who is not prejudiced, will vote against the resolution, because it is for the welfare of the United States of America, and it is necessary for help in winning this war immediately after hostilities cease. Without it, there will be chaos.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1543) entitled "An act to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1543) an act to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces and for other purposes, with a House amendment, insist on the amendment of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know from the gentleman from Kentucky if the ranking Republican member has been advised of the

fact that the bill was going to be referred to the conferees.

Mr. MAY. It is the invariable rule of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House to leave it to the ranking Republican member to name the conferees in all matters.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I did not mean that.

Mr. MAY. In this case he did name them a while ago and I wrote them down as he requested.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I did not mean that, but he knew this was going to be referred to the conferees?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I talked to him just a moment ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. MERRITT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. ELSTON of Ohio.

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ORGANIZATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192), with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that these questions have come up in the consideration of this joint resolution.

The State Department has worked in close cooperation with the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, conferences relating to U. N. R. R. A. having begun last July 1943 between these two committees and representatives of the State Department.

During July 1943 Assistant Secretary of State Acheson and Mr. Francis B. Sayre, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and laid before us the text of the proposed draft agreement, and entered into a detailed explanation and discussion of the plans for forming U. N. R. R. A.

As the result of these meetings, which continued until the introduction of House Joint Resolution 192 on November 15, 1943, modifications in the text of the draft agreement were suggested by Members of the Congress and were adopted, and it was agreed that the joint resolution, when introduced, would include the agreement in full, so as to give the Con-

gress the fullest opportunity to consider the extent of United States participation in U. N. R. R. A.

The U. N. R. R. A. agreement was signed at the White House on November 9, 1943. The President transmitted a message to the Congress on the subject on November 10, and on the same day the first session began, in Atlantic City, of the Council of the U. N. R. R. A. The session extended through December 1, 1943. The House of Representatives authorized travel expenses for members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to attend meetings of the council at Atlantic City, and various members of the committee attended some of the sessions and also the final plenary meeting on December 1.

In addition to the many informal executive conferences and meetings on the subject, the Foreign Affairs Committee held eight open hearings on House Joint Resolution 192, ending January 11, 1944.

It was suggested by members of the Senate subcommittee last summer that the text of the agreement should be placed in the resolution. This matter was also brought before our committee and at no time—and I feel that I am stating all of the facts—at no time has there ever been a motion made by any member of the committee that the agreement should be eliminated from the resolution. In fact, it would not have made any difference at all whether the agreement was eliminated or not. It was included in the joint resolution solely for the information of the Congress.

Now, there was no concealment of any information. I want to say this, that whenever any name was submitted to me as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be called before the committee as a witness at its hearings, I tried to get such persons and invited them to come before the committee. We went over this thoroughly. Indeed, I am surprised there should be so much talk here in this Chamber about this resolution such as we have had here, because at no time in all those months of consideration has there been as much dissension as there has been on the floor here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is one thing that is troubling me which I wish the gentleman would clear up. These 44 nations got together in the United States at the invitation of the President and of the State Department and joined in this agreement and signed it. Does the gentleman feel that the signing of the agreement at the invitation of our country has committed the United States to a policy which Congress must go along with and approve?

Mr. BLOOM. I will say this to the gentlemen, that this agreement does not commit the Congress to anything at all. If you do not appropriate or authorize this appropriation, why, of course, there is nothing to be done. Now, please remember this, that under the agreement

the question of contributions to U. N. R. R. A. is solely within the discretion of the appropriate constitutional bodies of the member governments. Of course, in the case of the United States, this means the Congress. The agreement itself says that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I yield. May I say this: Please ask all the questions that you would like to ask and let us try to answer them in such a way that we will all understand what we are trying to do here. I think after you find out that you will be just about in the same position and of the same mind as the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am asking these questions to get information.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right, and I would like to give it to you.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Because I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman says that all of these other countries will have to ratify this agreement, and I assume that is correct.

Mr. BLOOM. That is, the appropriate constitutional bodies would have to determine the extent of their participation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Now, will the agreement become operative before all the other countries have ratified it?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know whether you can say that the agreement would become operative. It is already in effect. There are 44 signatories of which 14 nations signed with reservations. I have a list here and I would like to read them to you. It might be of interest. These are the countries that have already contributed money:

Egypt.....	\$20,650
Philippines.....	5,000
Yugoslavia.....	5,000
Luxemburg.....	5,000
United Kingdom.....	100,000
Poland.....	50,000
Canada.....	50,000
Iceland.....	55,000
New Zealand.....	30,000
Belgium.....	100,000
Guatemala.....	5,000
French.....	50,000
Ethiopia.....	5,000
Norway.....	30,000
China.....	250,000

These are principally for administration expenses. All member countries are to contribute to administrative expenses. There are a few things in here that you have to understand; all countries contribute to administration expenses. No country can receive any financial benefits from U. N. R. R. A. if they have exchange credit with which to pay for their supplies. It does not make any difference who they are. The idea is this, they will get the benefit of technical assistance if they desire it, but no financial benefits in the way of supplies. That is one of the essentials of U. N. R. R. A.

Now, those countries that have dollar exchange or currency in this country do

not receive any financial benefit. They have to pay cash for their relief.

The question was asked before and I should like to get that clear because it is a very important point. A country that is not occupied by the enemy does not receive any benefit under U. N. R. R. A. For instance, England does not receive any benefits under U. N. R. R. A. U. N. R. R. A. does not begin to operate until after the country has been liberated and after a government which is recognized by the United Nations is exercising authority. Then U. N. R. R. A. comes in upon the request of the military authorities.

Now it is calculated that only 10 percent of the relief required for the liberated areas will be provided by U. N. R. R. A. and 90 percent of the total cost will be provided by the governments themselves. Even the poorer countries, for instance, will provide 90 percent of their own relief.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Coming back to the first premise, that is, ratification by other countries, will the Congress of the United States be required to appropriate the money authorized in this resolution before the other countries ratify the agreement?

Mr. BLOOM. The answer is "No." The answer is "No."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So all those other countries must first ratify the agreement?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps in further elucidation of the subject, the agreement is now in operation. Some countries have already contributed or started their contribution. We have not as yet contributed. We do not have to contribute unless the Congress appropriates the money. There is no committal forced upon any of the 44 governments.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If this resolution should fail and the Congress refuse to authorize any appropriation for our participation, U. N. R. R. A. goes ahead without us.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am asking these questions not in opposition to the resolution, but I am asking for information. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] this question: The gentleman states that certain countries, because they have dollar exchange in the United States, which are now occupied by the Nazis, will not get any benefits as long as they have dollar exchange in this country.

Mr. BLOOM. They will have to pay for it. If they get any relief they will have to pay for it out of what foreign exchange they may have, as long as they have the money. They get the relief benefits and everything else, but they have to pay for it. I should have said that they get no financial benefits out of it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can any of those countries which have dollar exchange buy anything here in the United States, or in any other country, with that exchange that might be delivered to them outside of U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. One of the purposes of this agreement is to prevent the countries that have money competing against each other in the world markets for supplies, and thus the country with the most money would get the most supplies and result in starving out a country with less money. Under this agreement all procurement of supplies must be with the approval of the joint organization which is charged with the duty of seeing to it that the available supplies are honestly and equally distributed, even though in many cases the country to be benefited will pay for it herself.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In a case like Denmark or Norway, they might want to buy 50,000 milk cows here. Will they be permitted to do that outside of U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They might not get the cows then?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The resources of this country must be taken into consideration. If that request is recommended by U. N. R. R. A. it goes before a joint board of American officials including, for example, the War Food Administration, the War Production Board, and they will make a survey of the resources of this country. If they make up their minds that the request for purchase in the United States will exhaust or unduly strain our resources, the answer will be "No."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then U. N. R. R. A. will control all exports to those countries of essential and other commodities?

Mr. WADSWORTH. When the supplies are finally procured, wherever they are procured, anywhere in the world, their distribution will be seen to by the central organization charged with the duty of seeing that it is done fairly, and stop competition between nations.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is this intended as permanent legislation?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; no.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has raised an interesting question by stating that if we do not approve this resolution, U. N. R. R. A. goes on without us. Does that mean that U. N. R. R. A. goes on without our contribution of 60 percent of the fund that is intended to be set up?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; it does.

Mr. DONDERO. What authority will this country then have in this particular type of international agency, if we do not make any contribution to it or accept it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None. To all intents and purposes we are out of it.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I anticipate a constitutional question.

Mr. GEARHART. I have one.

Mr. BLOOM. Very well, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEARHART. I would like to know just wherein a treaty, a copy of which appears in this joint resolution, but which so many Members like to call an executive agreement, differs from that type of international agreement which, under the Constitution of the United States, must be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Mr. BLOOM. I would say, as the gentleman certainly knows, that the difference between an agreement and a treaty is your opinion against mine, and my opinion against yours.

Mr. GEARHART. Oh, no.

Mr. BLOOM. I will say to the gentleman that the idea of embodying this agreement in the joint resolution originated in the Senate, which is the treaty-ratifying body. The ratifying body of treaties says that this is an executive agreement. The committee has already passed upon that, I believe. That is why it is here. I disagree with the gentleman in the statement that he made before with reference to the ratification of treaties, because that history is a long drawn-out history. My opinion is that this is 100 percent an agreement and not a treaty.

Mr. GEARHART. Now let us follow this a little further. The gentleman has said there is a difference between a treaty and an executive agreement, so-called.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Is not every international arrangement, whether you call it a treaty, a covenant, a convention or an executive agreement, just an agreement between nations?

Mr. BLOOM. You see when you come to an agreement between 44 different countries that are trying to do something, it depends upon so many different things that it does come more nearly to an agreement than to a treaty.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, what is the difference? That is what I am asking you. What is the distinction between an executive agreement which does not have to be ratified by the Senate, and a treaty which must be ratified and submitted to the Senate, under the Constitution of the United States? This body would like to know what is in the gentleman's mind. What is the distinction insofar as the gentleman is concerned?

Mr. BLOOM. No; what I would like to know is what is in the mind of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GEARHART. I should like to reach an understanding, too. I should like to tell the gentleman, if he does not know already, that there is not any distinction between an executive agreement and a treaty, because they are all international covenants; they are all international conventions; they are all international this or that, whatever you want to call them; they are all just agreements.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me? I should like to answer the question.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the chairman was very correct when he wanted to know what there was in the gentleman's mind. If the gentleman says there is no difference between an agreement and a treaty, why all this hullabaloo?

Mr. GEARHART. That is just the point. Now, just answer that.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that the State of Texas was admitted into the Union not by a treaty but by a joint resolution of Congress. Does the gentleman think it is a bad policy for the House of Representatives to legislate and to function with reference to these agreements? Or does the gentleman think that this House is unable to pass intelligently upon those matters, that all the wisdom is in the Senate of the United States? If he does not, what is he talking about?

Mr. GEARHART. I will tell the gentleman what I am talking about, and the gentleman seems to agree there is no difference.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I did not say that; I said the gentleman said so.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from California said so; the gentleman from Texas did not.

Mr. GEARHART. All right; if there is no difference then they are all treaties, and that is exactly what I contend is true: Every international agreement is a treaty.

Mr. BLOOM. According to the gentleman's own words, if there is no difference—the gentleman says they are all treaties—I say if there is no difference they are all agreements.

Mr. GEARHART. That is the point. If there is no agreement then all such matters should be submitted to the Senate under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BLOOM. Let me say a word here, because I have the floor; but I will be liberal in yielding.

Mr. GEARHART. Just a minute; I should like to finish my statement. The gentleman should not cut me off.

Mr. BLOOM. I think I have been very liberal with the gentleman. The gentleman says there is no difference between an agreement and a treaty. Why not then call them all treaties?

Mr. GEARHART. That is right; call them all treaties and be honest.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield to me for a minute?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. If that be the case, the gentleman on his own statement says they are all treaties—

Mr. GEARHART. That is right.

Mr. BLOOM. Then does not the gentleman feel I have the right to say under his own contention that they are all agreements?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Then they are all agreements; we agree.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes, that is exactly the point.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman from New York opened this thing up. He should not say for one minute that he wants to close the debate because the gentleman himself admitted the very point I wanted him to admit, that a treaty and an agreement, a covenant, and a convention, whatever you want to call an international arrangement, are all treaties.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not admit that; oh, I did not admit that.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, wait a minute.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not want the gentleman to say I admitted something I did not.

Mr. GEARHART. Let me finish my statement; I have not said that. What have we been asking each other?

Mr. BLOOM. That is what I should like to know.

Mr. GEARHART. All right; now, let us get this settled right now. I am leading up the point that any of them are treaties, any of them are agreements, any of them are covenants, any of them are conventions; and we use all those names.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel I can yield further. I have used a good deal of time here and as yet no one on the other side has spoken. I think I have been very fair with the gentleman.

Mr. GEARHART. No, I do not think the gentleman has. The gentleman has interrupted me in the middle of every statement I have attempted to finish.

Mr. BLOOM. Because the gentleman will not let me answer him.

Mr. GEARHART. I ask to be allowed to make my statement.

Mr. BLOOM. Proceed.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman listen to me and allow me to complete my statement? I will be through in a minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Proceed.

Mr. GEARHART. When I say they are all treaties or they are all agreements I do not contend all of them have to be submitted to the Senate for ratification. There are three distinct classes of agreements: Those which are made by the President without the necessity of referring them to the Senate when he is carrying into execution a definite constitutional obligation imposed upon him by the Constitution of the United States; then there is a second kind of executive agreement that does not have to be submitted to the Senate, agreements which are entered into pursuant to a preceding congressional mandate; and a third kind is the kind of international agreement which we call a treaty which must be submitted to the Senate for ratification, and that is one which does not involve the first two considerations I have been pointing out.

This is a subterfuge. This bill is an attempt to bypass the Constitution. This is an attempt to nullify the Constitution by bringing international agreements into the classification of the first two I mentioned, one or the other.

That is all I wanted to say,

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield until I get through making this statement; then I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has given his views with reference to the constitutionality of this legislation. There is no such thing as the constitutionality of anything.

Mr. MICHENER. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. BLOOM. The Supreme Court states that it does not rule on the constitutionality of any act. That is the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. It rules on the validity of an act. I am not a lawyer but I think I have studied the Constitution. Any time anyone wants to have 10 rounds on that with me some other place I would be very glad to take him on. But the Supreme Court states that it rules on the validity of an act. It never says the "constitutionality" or the "unconstitutionality" of an act.

We have been debating House Joint Resolution 192. This subject matter was brought to us by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This reference had the approval of some of the best minds. If there had been any doubt as to the interpretation of the Constitution with reference to treaties and the ratification of treaties, certainly the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would not have submitted this to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. That is the source from which we got this matter; it was brought to us from the Senate. If the Senate says it is an agreement and it comes to us as an agreement I think we have the right to accept it as an agreement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. To a member of the committee just for a question, yes; but I should like to go on.

Mr. MUNDT. I want the gentleman to yield for a statement.

Mr. BLOOM. For a statement, no. I will yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

Mr. MUNDT. But there is something I think I can clarify and certainly I believe the gentleman wants these points clarified as they come up and as we go along.

Mr. BLOOM. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to make just a very brief statement.

Mr. BLOOM. Very well; I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has a valid position in being disturbed in his thinking as to whether or not this is a treaty or an executive agreement. I believe, however, the chairman of the committee is correct in his statement that this is not the tribunal in which we can determine and settle the question of whether this is a treaty or an executive agreement. The tribunal which must in the final analysis determine that aspect of it is the United States Senate.

If the Senate chooses, even though unfortunately and unwisely in our opinion, to vacate its traditional jurisdiction over this bill from the standpoint of whether it is a treaty or an executive agreement it is not within the power of the House to insist that the Senate measure up to what we might consider to be its proper prerogatives. If the Senate or its Foreign Relations Committee chooses, even though we consider such a choice regrettable, to consider compacts such as this with foreign countries as executive agreements rather than treaties, this body and this House cannot, I am sure, do anything to compel the Senate to decide differently.

There were times in the history of this Republic when the great Senate of the United States was very jealous of its treaty-ratifying power, and when Senators, individually and collectively, insisted on the power of that body to participate in the drawing and ratifying of agreements with other countries by the special majority vote provided in the Constitution of the United States. Such may or may not be the case today, but it seems apparent that it is for the Senate to decide whether it is to vacate this authority and waive this right or whether it has satisfied itself that agreements of this type do not come under the classification of treaties.

Our job in the House is limited as I see it to the functions which definitely repose in the House of Representatives, and that is in the matter of making appropriations for the implementing of such foreign agreements as we approve of whether they be treaties or executive agreements.

When I discuss this in my time tomorrow, I hope to point out reasons why it is therefore doubly important that we scan this legislation from the standpoint of an appropriation and our direct relationship to it. As to whether it is a treaty or executive agreement, I believe the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is correct in saying that is something which must be determined by the membership of the Senate, and though we might like to have them consider it a certain way, if they refuse to do so or vacate their rights, there is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has stated that this is not permanent legislation; it is only temporary.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; that is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is there in the bill itself that defines it that way?

Mr. BLOOM. After 6 months' notice our Government can withdraw.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have not seen that in the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, it is there.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand it is in an agreement, but is it in the bill itself?

Mr. BLOOM. It is in the agreement. It is not in the bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The agreement is in the bill and this limitation is in the agreement?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. What makes this legislation temporary is the limitation upon the amount. When the amount of the authorization is used up, that is the end of the act. Unfortunately there is a probability that we may at some time use the full limitation on the amount.

Mr. BLOOM. There is a 6 months' provision. In the agreement there is the provision that we can withdraw after 6 months. On page 14, line 16, it is stated:

Any member government may give notice of withdrawal from the Administration at any time after the expiration of 6 months from the entry into force of the agreement for that government.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I want to refer to the joint resolution, No. 192, article III, which reads as follows:

Each member government shall name one representative and such alternates as may be necessary upon the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which shall the policy-making body of the Administration.

Later I hope to have the time to speak in regard to the rehabilitation features of House Joint Resolution 192. I have in my mind the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Journal, first session, Resolution 12 of that session having to do with matters of rehabilitation. Paragraph 11 reads:

The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief.

I would like to clarify that one word "coterminous," because the argument that I may have the privilege of presenting to this body will revolve about the matter and subject of rehabilitation. I have looked it up in the dictionary here in the House the word "coterminous." There is a word "coterminous" and a reference to "conterminous." The definition of "coterminous" is as follows:

Conterminous; specifically, biology, of groups of organisms, coextensive.

Now, then, I looked up the word "conterminous" and the definition is as follows:

Having a common boundary. Having the same bounds or limit; coextensive in space, time, or range; having the same ending.

The synonyms are, "adjacent, near, close, neighboring, bordering, immediate, touching, contiguous."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman ask his question.

Mr. DEWEY. I am getting to it. This is not a frivolous matter because I asked the same question directly in a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee when it was said that rehabilitation was coterminous with relief, and I understood

it was stated that it stopped at the same time as did relief, but the word itself has nothing to do with arrested motion. It delimits something, and it might mean that rehabilitation and relief may be of the same size. I would like to make a record now of my understanding in the committee that it means what I said.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is worried about the word "rehabilitation." The thought just occurs to me that the Veterans' Administration from the beginning has used the word "rehabilitation" to describe temporary benefits extended to veterans.

Mr. DEWEY. I am talking about "coterminous" and "conterminous."

Mr. BLOOM. I know what the gentleman is talking about, but I am trying to get the gentleman to understand what I am talking about.

You can talk about rehabilitation and define it in so many different ways that you might scare someone. I may say to the gentleman that this legislation in no way goes into the thought of reconstruction. The provision on page 3 involves food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and other basic necessities, medical and other essential services. In the matter of rehabilitation, or anything that comes within that scope, the work of U. N. R. R. A. is strictly limited to facilitation of the relief work. But this does not in any way go into the term "reconstruction."

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked a question and I would like to have it answered because I hope to have some time of my own.

Mr. BLOOM. To answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] if the gentleman is looking for an answer with reference to "reconstruction" and "rehabilitation" or the dividing line between the two, why, of course, I have not the time to answer it because the gentleman has looked up the dictionary.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt? I am not seeking in any way to cause a delay of the discussion, but this does use one word which I understood meant "stop," that rehabilitation would stop with relief, and the word "coterminous" is used. Now, "coterminous" does not mean "stop." If it is the gentleman's opinion that cotermination means stop, I am satisfied and I shall stop.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I say it is my understanding that everybody on the committee interpreted the word just as the gentleman did in its application to this bill.

Mr. DEWEY. Despite the application and general usage, as shown by the dictionary?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct; yes. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I will yield just for a question to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, then I decline to yield further. I must get through.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that this is important.

Mr. BLOOM. Otherwise I would not have yielded to the gentlewoman. I know it is important.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is important because the administration today in connection with the reconstruction or change-over of buildings is using the word "rehabilitation" for building.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. BLOOM. All right; I will yield.

Mr. MASON. The rest of us can do that, too.

Mr. BLOOM. All right, I will yield to the gentleman, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska withdraw his point of order?

Mr. CURTIS. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Is it not true that the central committee of the U. N. R. R. A. is made up of four members, China, Russia, Great Britain, and the United States, and by a majority vote they can prevent the financial reports of U. N. R. R. A. from being published?

Mr. BLOOM. The last part of it, no; but the first part of it, yes. It is in the agreement.

Mr. CURTIS. Then will the gentleman explain to me lines 12 to 15 on page 11, where it is stated:

The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the central committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential.

Mr. BLOOM. I will try to answer that in as brief a time as I can. Under the agreement the central committee is made up, as the gentleman has said, of four nations—China, Soviet Russia, the United States, and Great Britain. The council is made up of 44 nations. As to the report that the gentleman speaks of, I am going to answer his question, but I am first going to give him a picture. There are four countries there. There are England, the United States, China, and Russia. If those four countries get up a report, I think the Congress will be satisfied with it. I would like also to refer the gentleman to the provisions contained in the first few lines on page 15 of the joint resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. But three of them can keep the report away from the nation that furnishes 60 percent of the money; is not that true?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not ask, Would they do it? I asked, Could they do it?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. CURTIS. They could not do it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I have a question that I really want to get answered, and it is very plain.

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be delighted to try to answer it.

Mr. MASON. The text of the U. N. R. R. A. agreement, as printed in the bill, regardless of whether it is a treaty or an agreement, if this resolution is passed by the Congress and adopted, then becomes a substantive part of the law, and whether it is a treaty or an agreement it is then approved by the Congress. Is not that right?

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, the preamble, as we shall call it, of the report written by the committee, tells the story, and it reads as follows:

This war is causing great suffering. America has always heeded the call of human suffering. America has a genius for organization. This genius, applied to this great human need, has resulted in the community fund system throughout the United States. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is an international organization, developed on the principles of the American community fund system, to relieve human suffering caused by war. The characteristic elements are there; each member's contribution is voluntary, yet through organization the human needs are analyzed, the means to meet the needs are allocated, and the value of each contribution is thus enhanced. The U. N. R. R. A. is the community fund of the United Nations.

I would also like to call attention to the conclusion in the report, which reads as follows:

United States participation in the work of the U. N. R. R. A. is essential, if the United States is to carry out in the field of international action those responsibilities of world leadership which are imposed upon us by the deepest interests of the security and prosperity of the United States. The need for the U. N. R. R. A. is evident. The wake of human misery left by the German and Japanese war machines requires international action as a matter of necessity, as well as of humanity. The problems presented are international problems—the marshaling of available world supplies; the working out of agreements as to common standards for relief among the liberated areas; the establishing of reserves of supplies available for use in whatever areas may be liberated first; the prevention of competitive scrambling for limited relief and rehabilitation supplies in the world markets; and the provision for and control of the movement of displaced persons. International action is essential if the liberated peoples are to be put in position to help themselves. They must be given that additional strength which will enable them to go forward with us in the task of economic reconstruction and the building of a durable peace.

I also specifically call attention to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs put a limit of \$1,350,000,000 on the authorization, and then wrote a new section that was not in the joint resolution at the time, section 3. Section 3 gives the full understanding of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as to what this resolution calls for in the way of rehabilitation.

Therefore, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has taken every precautionary measure to safeguard the money whose appropriation will be authorized by this legislation, and to see that it is properly expended.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, America is always ready to help in the relief of human suffering, and Congress has repeatedly appropriated money, taxpayers' money, if you please, for the relief of human suffering in other countries all over the world, in great disasters and after wars.

There is no question but that the American people are going to do their share in taking care of the helpless, guiltless women and children, the victims of war, who are starving and naked and sick and homeless. The question is how to do it.

There are three ways we might go at it. One way would be to go it alone, until our generosity ran out. We might help much in meeting the real problem, but we would get credit for what we did. That was the old-fashioned Lady Bountiful method, a method which the Pharisees of the Bible adopted in giving alms, but it has somewhat gone out of style.

The second way would be to get up a world superstate and have that world superstate pass a law to assess every nation for relief. Perhaps Mr. WALLACE and some others in this town and over the world may want that plan, but that is not my idea.

The third way would be the American community-fund idea, where there are voluntary contributions, but a suggested quota for each member is made by the organization. You analyze the needs, set up an "asking budget," and then allocate the means to meet the needs so as to go as far as possible. It is as American as pumpkin pie, and it is the basis of U. N. R. R. A.

I intend to speak something about the organization and financial plan here, but I want to do one thing first. I want to beg of you all to read this bill that contains the full agreement, and to read the resolutions on policy adopted at Atlantic City by the Council of U. N. R. R. A., appendix 1, pages 295 to 328 of the hearings before you.

You cannot understand about U. N. R. R. A. without the labor of reading what it is about. Carlyle in Sartor Resartus had a character, a professor, Teufelsdröckh, who was a professor of things in general, and we have a few of those in the Congress here, who know everything about everything, but I think most of you will not be able to understand this great, elaborate, detail mechanism by merely closing your eyes and taking a deep breath. You have got to study, and you may make a grave mistake if you vote on this without knowing what it is and what it is not.

First, as to the organization, there are 44 nations, grouped like this: There is the Big Four and 19 American republics, and then 9 European refugee governments and 6 governments that are a part of the British Empire, and then there are 6 consisting of Ethiopia and Liberia in Africa, Iceland, the Philippines, Iraq, and Iran. That is the way the thing is set up. Complaint was made, I understand, at Atlantic City, that with 20 American republics usually voting together, and with Liberia and the Philippines following along with the United States, and

with the United States having the Director, that our country had control of U. N. R. R. A. I confess that while that complaint may or may not be justified, I do not feel terribly ashamed that my country is the dominant, if not the dominating, member of U. N. R. R. A.

The agreement, section III, provides for the Central Committee, the Big Four, and they take charge between the council meetings. Section IV provides for the executive, the Director General, who is nominated by the unanimous action of the Big Four. Section VIII provides for amendment and provides that there cannot be any change in articles III and IV without the unanimous consent of the Big Four. Section VIII further provides that no new obligations can be voted on any country without that country's consent.

In view of these provisions those people who say and who fear that this agreement in this bill takes away the power of the United States to govern itself, are seeing spooks in the dark, and I respectfully submit are talking through their hats.

We have had much discussion of executive agreements and treaties. I might mention that this Government's Chief Executive has made about 1,000 executive agreements in our history, most of them before the New Deal was ever heard of. I think the New Deal has used executive agreements, without congressional authority before or after, in a reckless manner, but in this instance this executive agreement has been passed on by a number of constitutional lawyers in both the House and Senate, and is here for authorization from Congress, so that it may be provided with the wherewithal, the money, to go forward. Therefore, any further debate about its nature is futile. Congress can authorize executive agreements. It has in the past a long series of them, for instance, in our international postal laws, and trademark laws, and boundary-dispute agreements, and many others. It seems to me that this device of having the Executive enter into agreements, which are clearly within his province, as this one is, to carry on an executive function, and then submit the thing in toto to the Congress for the authorization of the money for activities under it—that that mechanism eliminates any constitutional questions either in the strict sense, or in the spirit of the Constitution, which depends upon collaboration and teamwork between the Executive and the Congress.

Now, on the financial plane, as has been said today, but not mentioned earlier in the newspapers, the world-wide relief problem of taking care of the war-stricken areas is, as far as anybody can now estimate, about a \$20,000,000,000 problem, not a \$2,000,000,000 problem. The United States is called upon to contribute not 60 to 65 percent of \$20,000,000,000, but 6 percent of this total. Payment for most of the supplies and materials is going to come from the countries where the people needing relief live. It is the basis of U. N. R. R. A. that we are going to help people help themselves, and the mechanism of allocation

of supplies and securing materials is designed for that purpose.

We come now to the 1-percent proposition. Why was the national income chosen as the yardstick? They tried out a lot of others—exports, the number of people, the size of territory—but none of them was nearly as satisfactory and as fair a measurement of the ability of a country to "kick in" as its national income. Why was 1943 chosen? Because when you are choosing ability to pay, you better pick the time when you are going to make the payment, or near that time. That yardstick, no matter whether our income has advanced more than other countries or not, is fair so long as you take the same proportion of each country's national income, because the same percentage of each man's income, or each country's income, fairly approximates ability to pay.

Each country gets to measure its own national income. Remember, this is all voluntary. I have been inquiring into that, to find out whether the standards over the world are about the same as ours. I find that ours is conservative, and that the other countries follow about the same standard. Also I find that certain countries are making ready to put in more than perhaps our figures might show for them. You wonder why? Well, there is going to be some sort of reconstruction mechanism developed and if any country cuts down its participation in U. N. R. R. A. in order to save money, it will then be faced by that small amount as being its proper proportion, when a bank, which will be a profitable institution to enter, is being created. So, we therefore have conflicting interests in each country which make them fairly anxious to do their part. But people say, Why is it that of those countries contributing—there cannot possibly be, under the rules, more than 30, and there may not be that many—why is it that of the unoccupied countries of the world, we contribute 60 to 65 percent of the total? And I certainly asked that question the first time I heard of it, because it came as a shock to me and a surprise, as it must to you, to realize that we are so overwhelmingly the richest country on earth.

When you have a community fund and go according to ability, then the richest giver makes the biggest contribution.

Now, there are many limitations upon U. N. R. R. A. Some of them are in these resolutions on policy which I beg of you to read. U. N. R. R. A. is not to be political and it is not to be for reconstruction, and I think we have gone over "coterminous" sufficiently to have you realize that we have incorporated in this law the language limiting this to relief as far as you can limit it to relief. If you are going to stick just to food, clothes, and shelter, what are you going to do about situations like this? Is it not cheaper to send seeds over there to have the people put in a crop for the next year than to feed them all this year and next year? Suppose it is cheaper to send some cloth over there and have them sew it up in a patched-up textile mill than to have the clothing made in our mills and shipped in our vessels? In those countries where

they are going to have to have coal to keep from freezing, and I understand relief coal may amount to as much as 11,000,000 tons in these areas, it might be cheaper if we could find some means of rehabilitating some of their mines and patching them up so the people over there could dig their own coal. Is that not a better proposition than for us to load coal from the United States in American ships and take it over there? That is why you have to have something more here than merely provision for relief. It is limited as much as human language can limit it. They divide rehabilitation from construction or reconstruction. They say they are not trying to solve the world unemployment problem. If they stick to their language in performance they have made fair limitations.

I think there are two more limitations on the activity of U. N. R. R. A. It will not go into any area until the military say to come in. The disposition of the military will be to continue complete charge of an area until order and civilian economy is restored enough that they dare get out, rather than let U. N. R. R. A. in only partially. They will not take over until the military is through. Then if a reconstruction mechanism for borrowing money on safe terms for safe and sane reconstruction projects is erected, as I feel sure it must be, and our committee is shortly going into Mr. Dewey's proposal, there will be countries that rather than patch up a coal mine or patch up a factory or patch up a sewer system, will want to reconstruct it and will want to borrow money and go ahead with the long-term projects. Instead of turning to U. N. R. R. A. for limited repairs as required by the rules of U. N. R. R. A., and by the limitations which we ourselves here reinforced by section 3, they will go through the reconstruction mechanism and borrow money. It may be, and I hope and pray, as I know you do, that the field which U. N. R. R. A. will be forced to meet will be more limited than we think.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EATON. I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Of course, only God Almighty knows how long this planet is going to need war relief. You cannot budget human suffering. You can budget what you are going to do about it.

But I want to emphasize that this \$1,350,000,000 is not an appropriation; it is not an obligation; it is a limitation. It is inconceivable that anything like that amount will be appropriated the first time. The rules of U. N. R. R. A. call for approximately proportionate calls on all contributing members, and when a call comes on us the Appropriations Committee will go to work and will examine it, and then we, the Congress, will see whether we will contribute. Congress will act. When they say, "We will need some more money," we will say, "What have you been doing?" We will look that over, and if Congress approves, we will say, "Well, we will contribute again." But Congress itself, if it passes this act,

cannot contribute over the 1 percent till another authorization bill goes through.

Now, as to the personnel, I feel that former President Hoover should have been made head of the U. N. R. R. A. However, I am forced to confess that although starting out with a prejudice against Governor Lehman, after I heard him talk and I talked to him myself, and when I read his words which you have before you, I was convinced of his high purpose and of his determination to hold this thing to a practical basis and to carry out this motto of his not to put these people on a W. P. A., but to "help them to help themselves." I think Assistant Secretary Acheson, our member of the council, efficient, intelligent, tactful, hard-working, with a broad grasp of this problem, has done a good job and will do a good job.

I have criticisms of U. N. R. R. A., not in the international field, but in the domestic handling. I do not want to see this handled as a blank-check appropriation to the President. I want to see it go to the State Department or the Treasury Department or some old-line statutory department, instead of the F. E. A., a 4-month-old war baby born of an Executive order, which I want to see liquidated, rather than perpetuated, when the war is over.

But while I may criticize, while this is not perfect, while changes may be needed, while it may even fail, it is our responsibility to give it a chance. For 5 years I have been arguing for more cooperation between the Executive and Congress. And now we have got it. Some of those who, with me, complained that the Executive was ignoring Congress, now that this thing is presented to us and Congress was being consulted, are now complaining that the Executive is trying to put us on the spot. Well, brethren, you are on the spot with U. N. R. R. A. This, the first formal working post-war organization for a specific purpose with limited powers, by its very terms is dependent upon your action to succeed and to go forward. It is unthinkable to me that you are going to refuse, by your vote, to give this American-type project a chance to try to help the war-stricken people of the world.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I would like to ask regarding the determination of 1943 as the base year, was the year 1943 adopted as the base year for an indefinite period of time ahead or was it to be changed always to the nearest year?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. This is the only suggestion for any contribution to U. N. R. R. A. forever so far as U. N. R. R. A. has ever asked for any, and so far as our laws provide. There are those who think U. N. R. R. A. will not get by with this money and will have to come back. I think if they do it wisely they may get through on this. But there is not any repetition of annual contributions. This is supposed to be once and for all.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Was there any effort to arrive at any other year than 1943 on any other basis?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I understand that they argued over a dozen or a score of different formulas, different years, and so forth, and came to the conclusion finally that national income was a fair figure and the national income of the year in which you started to pay was fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EATON. I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I want to ask the gentleman the same question as I asked the chairman of the committee. The fact that the text, you might say, of U. N. R. R. A. is incorporated in this bill, whether it is an agreement or whether it is a treaty makes no difference, if this resolution is passed, then does that mean that that text is adopted as a part of the substantive law of this land?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In my opinion, it is not. It is no more a part of the substantive law than if the Lord's Prayer, or some other document, were quoted in a statute. It appears in the text, it is there, but it is not a part of the substantive law. I am of the opinion it cannot even be amended on this floor, because we cannot amend documents that, in fact, exist some place else and where what is before us only purports to be a copy.

Mr. MASON. Then you say it is just included for our information and enlightenment?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. We have some great humanitarian institutions in this country, such as the American Red Cross, China Relief, Greek Relief, which extend relief to distressed peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Will their activities abroad be brought to an end if this resolution is passed?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No; they will cooperate with U. N. R. R. A. Practically all of the important ones were represented at Atlantic City by observers and were members of the American delegation. I know, for instance, that the American Red Cross support this. I went to them months ago and said, "Why do you not take on this job? I will help get a bill through to do it." They said, "Frankly, this is too big a job for us. The way to do is to have this type of organization and we will work with and through and under them."

Mr. HANCOCK. And U. N. R. R. A. has the approval and the support of such organizations?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; they were present at the council meeting.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to the words on page 7, "Member government,"

to what and to whom does that refer, as respects the United States?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There is a definition of "Member government" earlier in the resolution, on page 5, at the top of the page, but that refers to the United States, and to the President signing as the Chief Executive signs for us. However, as has been said repeatedly, nothing happens as far as our money is concerned, until the appropriations are authorized. We have assurance that nothing has happened so far; no American supplies have been allocated. I may disagree with my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. U. N. R. R. A. may be technically in existence now, but I feel that if the United States does not contribute and go forward, the whole thing will fail. The fate of this whole relief project rests in our hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in advance that I am in full sympathy with the purposes of U. N. R. R. A. I have seen after the last war, the difficulties that have existed in the devastated countries of Europe, over which the battles have been fought, and the terrible condition of the people and the terrible problems that faced them. I feel that we can give of our wealth. Even if we have to tighten our belts, we can give of our surplus to help these war-devastated people in food, medicine, and clothing. In fact, to a certain extent, start them toward self-support by an opportunity to obtain their own livelihoods.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it should be stated at this point that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] was financial adviser to Poland following the last war, and had much to do with the reconstruction of that great country.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank my colleague from California.

I studied this resolution with great seriousness when it first came to my attention, as well as the agreements that were being entered into in Atlantic City. I am perfectly free to confess that I was troubled by one item that has been discussed here on the floor by some of the Members. That is the matter of rehabilitation contained in the title "United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration." I have questioned some of the officers of the executive department to ascertain from them what was meant by "rehabilitation," and just how far rehabilitation might be carried. I was assured by them that rehabilitation, as they conceived it, meant only doing that which was necessary to make relief effective.

I agree that those things will have to be done, but pressure to do more will be asked of us after the war in those coun-

tries of the Old World. We also may suspect that international politics may play a part, and as we are only one member of the four members of the Central Council, pressure may be placed upon us to go further, and to make commitments further than we here in the United States had originally contemplated. Hence, I have given particular attention to the rehabilitation work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

I appeared, thanks to the courtesy of the chairman, before the Foreign Affairs Committee. Later I would like to query him on a point then agreed to. I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs with House Joint Resolution 207, of which I am the author. That resolution took up the matter of rehabilitation in collaboration with U. N. R. R. A. and carried it forward from the point where relief would stop.

Earlier in the session I laid particular stress on the word "coterminous," because I wanted to have it in the record that "coterminous" meant "stop." It is stated in section 12 of the first session of the U. N. R. R. A. council proceedings that rehabilitation would be coterminous with relief. But we are going to have many cases where it cannot possibly stop with relief. As an example we have the matter of displaced people. First, they will be fed where they are found, but later they will have to be brought back to their native lands. But when they are brought back there it will be a matter of feeding them again if we do not give them some housing and some means of livelihood.

Now, that is probably where rehabilitation would start under the provisions of House Joint Resolution 207.

As I have said, I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the intention of offering House Joint Resolution 207 as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 192, which is now under consideration. I was asked by members of the administration, particularly Mr. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, not to press it as an amendment for fear it might cause delay in the passage of House Joint Resolution 192; might cause the bringing in of discussions and other considerations. So I agreed I would not press for an amendment at this time, provided that immediate hearings would be held on House Joint Resolution 207, when House Joint Resolution 192 had been disposed of.

Now I want to ask the chairman this question: I shall stand by my word and not offer House Joint Resolution 207 as an amendment, but I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you will have hearings on it as soon as this bill is disposed of, and I would like to suggest within 2 weeks. I yield to the gentleman from New York for an answer to my question.

Mr. BLOOM. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that page 3, the last line of the report, reads as follows:

Representative DEWEY, of Illinois, appeared and proposed House Joint Resolution 207 as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 192. He withdrew his suggestion however on re-

ceiving definite assurance from the chairman that hearings would be held on House Joint Resolution 207 after action was completed on House Joint Resolution 192.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois can tell me when we shall be able to get through, get House Joint Resolution 192 out of the way, I will be able to tell him when we will proceed on his resolution.

Mr. DEWEY. I want more assurance than that because "after" is a long while. I am ready and would like to appear within 3 weeks from today.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. I think I have been very fair right from the start. I believe the gentleman from Illinois will admit that. I am ready to go on the moment we get U. N. R. R. A. out of the way so there will not be any conflict, for our time will be taken up between now and then; we might be in conference for a long time mornings. I can assure the gentleman that the committee intends to take it up immediately after U. N. R. R. A. is out of the way.

Mr. DEWEY. "Out of the way." By that does the gentleman mean after the other body has acted on it? Does he mean after the Committee on Appropriations has acted? That might be 3 or 4 months.

Mr. BLOOM. "Out of the way," so far as action by the House and Senate are concerned and it is on its way to the President. The question of appropriation is another thing.

Mr. DEWEY. Why could we not have earlier hearings on House Joint Resolution 207? I am standing by my word.

Mr. BLOOM. So am I.

Mr. DEWEY. I have only one chance of offering it as an amendment to this bill, and that will be tomorrow, or Monday, or whenever the bill is read for amendment. I want a little more definite commitment as to the time I will be before the gentlemen's committee. The Senate might consider the matter for many days.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman wants more assurance than he has been given, why not let him offer it as an amendment?

Mr. DEWEY. Would the gentleman like to have me offer it as an amendment?

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman is not satisfied with the chairman's statement.

Mr. DEWEY. If the gentleman wishes me to offer it as an amendment, I will take him up. I have given my word. And I tell the gentleman that if I offer it as an amendment, I will have plenty of backing for it.

Mr. JARMAN. The chairman of the committee has given his word.

Mr. BLOOM. I have given my word; I have even put it in the report.

Mr. DEWEY. I want to deal with this just as I want to deal with "coterminous," I want to delimit "afterwards."

Mr. BLOOM. I put "co-terminus" in this. Co-terminus, concurrent—I will do anything the gentleman wants, but if

there is any Member of either branch of this Congress who can say definitely when legislation will pass or will not pass it is a wonder. I say that as soon as the Senate concludes its consideration of this bill and it is on its way to the President, immediately after that I will send the gentleman a special invitation to appear, I will come and get him myself and bring him over there and we will have a nice meeting on his resolution. I cannot do any more than that. To say a specific date I cannot.

Mr. DEWEY. I will take the gentleman's commitment, and if I may proceed now—

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman may proceed; he started this; I did not.

Mr. DEWEY. Yes; but I always like to sign, seal, and deliver matters that pertain to legislation and when I am handling other people's money.

House Joint Resolution 207 sets up a well understood, American way of doing business, and that is by joint account. It is an old custom here in this country of ours.

When people wish to enter into an engagement to do something beyond their personal means they get around them some friends, discuss the subject, and then once having complete knowledge of it one takes one share, we will say one-half interest, another takes a quarter of an interest, and the third takes the last quarter. They all enter on the same basis. The matter is perfectly understood. On the other hand, I have had some experience and I fear the complications of these large organizations, world-wide in scope.

We know today that the first two provisions of the Atlantic Charter, having to do with territories, have been breached. We know that the "four freedoms" better have a fifth one added—freedom from suspicion. When we are dealing with other nations I think it is a good thing for us to have a body or group that will meet the representatives of those countries on an equal basis, take up each project as it may be presented, and discuss it, and if advisable, go along with them. I give you as an example, let us say, our good friend Greece. It may be the first country that will be evacuated of the Axis troops. Then they will want to have rehabilitation probably going much further than could be done by U. N. R. R. A. What would happen? Probably the Greek authorities would outline a plan. They might then call in the authorities from Russia, from England, probably the Turks would like to take part, the French, and ourselves. The Greek program would be considered as an individual project and be accepted or rejected on its merits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I have provided in House Joint Resolution 207 for an administrative body and a fund, a revolving fund, to be used for rehabilitation

purposes. The money for the revolving fund will be appropriated from the stabilization fund now under the jurisdiction of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. It will cost the American people nothing for the simple reason that the stabilization fund was developed by increasing the value of gold from \$20 an ounce to \$35. Supervising that fund as a board of directors will be two members appointed from the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, two Senators, and two Congressmen. A chairman of that board of directors will be appointed by the President, who will be empowered to meet the representatives of foreign countries on these matters of rehabilitation. If this kind of organization is carried out it will serve as a "stopgap" between the period when relief stops and more permanent reconstruction comes in. It will do away with the dangers that are foreseen by some of the speakers here of setting up knitting mills, complete railroad systems, public-utility systems out of U. N. R. R. A. funds wherein we would lose control and where we, as one of the members of a council of four, would have only one vote. The U. N. R. R. A. administration could stick to the provisions of U. N. R. R. A., which is only to do rehabilitation as far as is necessary to carry out relief and turn over to the central reconstruction fund provided in House Joint Resolution 207 those matters of greater rehabilitation and do them in the American way on joint account with other nations well disposed on an equal basis, and all to have an opportunity to study each subject as it may arise.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I understand the gentleman's position he is not opposed to the present bill, but the plan provided for under his bill would begin when this plan ends; in other words it supplements the work of U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. DEWEY. It does not begin when this plan ends but it supplements this plan during its life.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. And it is a different field of work.

Mr. DEWEY. It is a broader field of rehabilitation based on carefully worked out programs.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Following the point just brought out by the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Illinois has referred repeatedly to the possibility that the American members of U. N. R. R. A. might be overridden and that rehabilitation might go beyond anything he has been assured is the intention.

Mr. DEWEY. That is the fear.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. It is to be remembered all the time that this

is an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill, that the Congress keeps control over the funds, it would have reports, and if at any time it is felt by the Congress that they were going beyond the powers laid down by this law, it is always possible to check the appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DEWEY. I may say in answer to the gentleman from New Hampshire that there is always the danger of commitments. There are always dangers in operating great undertakings such as this with 44 other nations that one might build the front steps of an edifice, then come back to the Congress and say, "We made the commitment to build the edifice itself." This would take care of all such matters.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Of course, there is danger in walking down Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. DEWEY. Yes; but the dangers of foreign commitments are well known in our experiences in foreign matters after the last war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, throughout the history of this country it has been but natural, because of the benevolent, charitable, humanitarian and Christian disposition of our people, to gladly answer calls for relief by suffering people. It commenced as far as my memory goes back, in the little town where I was reared, when a widow and her children were suffering, someone who was dependent on a salary had become injured or a transient came in and was without means of support, one or more public-spirited citizens went about among the people and took up a collection for the relief of that specific sufferer. Later that attitude on the part of the people in my little town and your little town resulted in the Community Chest idea, whereby, instead of indulging in collections for every specific need, we contribute annually to an organization which has personnel experienced in distributing these funds. When the need arises the funds are available.

America has not confined its contributions for relief to its own towns. Back in the last World War we remember the relief in Belgium, in the 1940 unpleasantness we contributed generously toward Finnish relief, and in recent years toward the alleviation of the suffering of Greeks, Chinese, and other suffering humanity. In the meantime, those excellent organizations, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and so forth, have been with us. During the last war, as has been indicated, America contributed approximately \$2,600,000,000 for relief, which, incidentally, was approximately 4 percent of its national income at that time as contrasted with the 1 percent of our present national income which is requested and proposed in the pending resolution.

If the need back yonder, in my and your little town, for that widow and her children was great, if the need of Belgium in the other war was great, and the need in Finland in 1940 and in Greece and China and the other countries now is great, I say to you that I fear very much those needs will all but fade into insignificance when compared with the necessities which will exist, which do exist now, as a matter of fact, in the liberated countries, and which will exist in many others after this war is over.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to my friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Does the gentleman recognize that the administration of foreign relief after the last war was very efficiently performed under the direction of Herbert Hoover?

Mr. JARMAN. That is quite correct.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. By a very simple method?

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Does the gentleman know of any reason why the same simple method could not be employed now in the administration of relief throughout the world?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. May I suggest that we spent for relief at the end of the last war over \$3,000,000,000? The hope is that by organizing in advance for this situation that is coming up and getting the other countries to contribute we might thereby lessen the amount of our contribution and at the same time have the other countries go along with us. That is the reason we are acting before the war ends rather than wait until it ends, as we did before.

Mr. JARMAN. That is one reason. There are others, some of which have been stated.

The situation which will confront us after this war is not the little problem that existed in my town of Livingston, Ala., consisting of a thousand people back yonder, with a widow and several children, it is not a problem that Alabama or Ohio or America or Finland or Greece could very well care for alone, because there is not only the financial phase of it, there are various other grave problems with which we will be confronted. It is an international problem, that is a United Nations problem, not only from a financial standpoint, but also for other reasons. Relief supplies are going to be scarce. It must be internationally or United Nations supervised, as has been said, to prevent the country which has a large foreign exchange in gold from gobbling up all of the supplies. There must be an evenness of relief in the different countries as far as is possible. There is the care for and transportation of the displaced persons, who are now roaming all over Europe, more or less, back to their countries.

Those are several reasons why it is a different situation and must be handled differently, in addition to the one the

distinguished gentleman from Texas mentioned.

What is the alternative? Two or three. We do not have to pass this legislation, of course. Our failure to do so will not prevent the other countries from proceeding as best they can. Naturally, being the richest and the largest Nation in the world, we are contributing more than any other country, and it would not succeed as well without us. There is another alternative. It is for the whole world to just forget it, let it go, and not attempt to indulge in any relief of these suffering people.

Where does that lead? It leads to chaos and anarchy in a large part of the world, which would endanger us all; in fact, it would endanger the very civilization we know. I believe, and I think most of us of the Committee on Foreign Affairs believe, that it behooves us not only to participate in this humanitarian and necessary endeavor but even more to take the lead in it.

The concept of concerted action back yonder in 1941 has been explained. I want to emphasize, however, a phase of the background which has also been referred to. After the United States and Russia entered the conflict, they joined this group which originally discussed the matter in London in 1941. Both of them suggested that it should be broadened to take in other Allied countries. The first discussions were commenced between representatives of China, Russia, the United Kingdom, and America and were soon extended to include other United Nations. A tentative agreement was prepared, with which all the United Nations were circularized.

At the same time, as you have been told, all of the facts, the tentative agreement, the need as far as it could be foreseen, and all of the circumstances were explained in detail to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body and to our Committee on Foreign Affairs. Suggestions were invited from the members of these committees and from the proposed member nations. Many suggestions were offered, both by the nations and by the members of our committees. The great majority of these suggestions were incorporated into a new tentative agreement, with which these 44 nations were again circularized, and which was immediately brought to these two committees of the Congress for our information and suggestions. This second tentative agreement resulted in unanimous acceptance by the 44 nations, and there naturally followed the conference at the White House on November 9, 1943, when it was signed, and the meeting of the Council in Atlantic City the following day.

At that meeting the first United Nations service agency, in fact, the first international service agency with which I am familiar, was commenced, and there began the first effort to ascertain whether the United Nations, which have cooperated so magnificently and successfully in war, can cooperate in peace.

Most of us, I think, have long since become convinced, as illustrated by the passage of the Fulbright and Connally resolutions, that the day of sticking our

heads in the sand like an ostrich and hoping and believing that the rest of the world will pass us by unmolested, undisturbed, and unnoticed, has gone forever. The world cannot stand the shock of another such war as this every 25 years, and no individual country can prevent it. It can be prevented only by international, or at least United Nations, cooperation. If we cannot cooperate in this first step, if America will not participate in this first elementary step, a step comparable to taking care of the widow and her children down in my and your little town, I say there is little hope that we may look forward to cooperation in bigger things, the things that really will count in the future of the world and the salvation of the American way of life and the civilization we know.

It has been mentioned that the one, whole, and only purpose of U. N. R. R. A. is to help the liberated peoples—and do not forget the word "liberated"—to help themselves.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. We have already liberated the Algerians, the Tripolitans, the Sicilians, and the people of southern Italy, and we are feeding them now. We are preventing them from starving. If we can do that now, why do we need this legislation?

Mr. JARMAN. Because they have been paying for it so far, and their funds are not going to last.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. It is with pleasure that I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I say that the French have paid back to us all the cost of the food and clothing which through lend-lease we delivered in Algeria.

Mr. GEARHART. Is it going to be subject to condemnation that they pay us back? Let us get something back once in a while.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am praising them for it.

Mr. GEARHART. Let us go on on that basis.

Mr. JARMAN. We are happy to have it paid back, I may say to my able colleague. We are merely answering the gentleman's question.

It should be understood, as has already been said, that U. N. R. R. A. is by no means undertaking the whole job of relief. It is estimated that 90 percent of the relief supplies will either be produced locally or purchased by this international exchange and gold in the possession of occupied countries, to which reference has been made. The Council suggested to members of the unoccupied countries that they contribute 1 percent of their latest known national income—that for the year ending June 30, 1943. This does not apply to the countries just mentioned, by my colleague from California, which have been occupied. Our part of that expense, sad and terrible to say, amounts to the expense of only 5 days of this war. We would much prefer that it be different, but it is costing this

country the amount of this authorization each 5 days of war. We of the Committee on Foreign Affairs believe that it is worth while, insofar as finances go only, to extend this war—that is, financially—5 days after its conclusion, because of the tremendous hope for the future of civilization that is held out to us by doing so.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. I notice that on the first page of the joint resolution three words are stricken out. It states:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time—

The words "from time to time" are stricken out. Certainly when this bill was drawn it was not contemplated that \$1,350,000,000 would be the extent of the amounts we shall be called upon to authorize for appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. JARMAN. Absolutely. It is contemplated that that will be the total. The gentleman will notice that the words "from time to time" have been dropped down three lines from where they are stricken out. It is just a shifting of words. The words now appear in the sixth line.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, I see that; but certainly that does not mean the same as the way the bill was originally drawn. It was originally contemplated that these appropriations would be from time to time, if I can read the English language.

Mr. JARMAN. I do not believe it has been mentioned here today, but the facts are that the original bill included no amount. It just had the phrase "from time to time," "such amounts as may be necessary," or wording to that effect. On motion of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] a maximum amount of \$1,350,000,000 was placed in the bill, that being the maximum it is anticipated will be needed. The phrase "from time to time" was retained to indicate that the whole amount will not be appropriated now, but that the aggregate amount will be appropriated from time to time. I think approximately \$500,000,000 is what will be first requested to be appropriated for use during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. Do not overlook the fact that this \$1,350,000,000 is an aggregate, a total authorization, as definitely distinguished from an annual one.

Mr. LEWIS. May I suggest that while it has been stated here that \$3,000,000,000 were used to accomplish this same purpose after the First World War, in fact there was only a little more than \$1,000,000,000 used by the Hoover committee, as I recall it, and the rest of the \$3,000,000,000 went to loans made from time to time, which were supposed to be repaid to the United States, but were never repaid. Is that correct?

Mr. JARMAN. One billion dollars in loans, as the gentleman says, directly for relief purposes, primarily for foodstuffs, and \$1,300,000,000 in credits established by the United States Treasury for them in this country for this purpose, of which

total about 10 percent was paid. Then also there was \$340,000,000 in gifts from private agencies in this country, and about \$37,000,000 in governmental gifts. May I add that we expect private gifts again?

Mr. LEWIS. And the rest of it was canceled.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. But the Hoover committee used a little over \$1,000,000,000, did it not?

Mr. JARMAN. I am not sure what the division of the total between the Hoover committee and the other relief organizations was.

Mr. LEWIS. Certainly let me suggest to the gentleman that the devastation caused by this war extends over a far wider scope of territory than the devastation of the First World War. That has already occurred, and, of course, there will be much further devastation. How can it successfully be claimed that \$1,350,000,000 is the limit of what we shall be called upon to authorize as our effort to carry out the commitments in this U. N. R. R. A. proposal?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman has placed his finger upon the main purpose of this resolution, and particularly the main desirability of it from the standpoint of the United States. The gentleman, who knows I am very fond of him, says, as I said, the need for relief will fade into insignificance when compared with that existing heretofore. The last time we tried to care for it alone, and we did not entirely succeed, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 7 minutes more.

Mr. JARMAN. The last time we tried diligently to do it alone. Our failure and the expense are two reasons which prompt us to wish cooperation this time. We do not want to again attempt to do it by ourselves. This is our part. I believe the gentleman is overlooking those of the other nations, which are, of course, much smaller than ours. The gentleman is also overlooking local contributions, which will be supervised by U. N. R. R. A.—90 percent.

Mr. LEWIS. May I suggest that our contribution is about 60 percent of the total, whatever that total is.

Mr. JARMAN. Of the expense for supplies. I think the gentleman is correct. He is not referring to administrative expenses which are apportioned differently. It is about 60 percent, as the distinguished gentleman says, because that is what our national income justifies as compared with those of other United Nations.

Mr. BLOOM. Sixty percent—1 percent of the income of different nations, but it is not 60 percent of the total expense of U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman really means that it is 60 percent of the 10 percent of the total cost of U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. LEWIS. Then I want to follow that by another question. What is to be the total cost?

Mr. JARMAN. As has been stated several times today—it is approximately

\$20,000,000,000, which is to be supervised, it is hoped, by U. N. R. R. A., but 90 percent of the total will be supplied locally, or by this international exchange or gold in possession of the countries, U. N. R. R. A. supplying financially only 10 percent, of which 10 percent we Americans supply 60 percent, except as to administrative expenses.

Mr. LEWIS. What, in addition to 60 percent, will be America's proportion of what is it—\$20,000,000,000?

Mr. JARMAN. That is all. That is what this resolution authorizes, 60 percent of the 10 percent of total relief to be paid for by U. N. R. R. A., or approximately \$1,350,000,000. We do not know whether that will finish the job or not. We sincerely hope it will.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to my friend, the ranking member of our committee.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman is aware that, of course, before the Axis Powers acted, some of these countries that had gold reserves took those gold reserves, and they escaped the Axis Powers, so those countries, Belgium, France, Norway, and Holland, have gold in reserve, in exchange, that can be used, and so where those countries have gold reserves they will pay for their own relief, and U. N. R. R. A. will administer it.

Mr. LEWIS. I wondered if the gentleman can tell us the amount of those gold reserves that have escaped the Axis?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I do not know whether that is a military secret or not.

Mr. BLOOM. I can show it to the gentleman.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. There may be some question about releasing those amounts, because of conditions over there, but they are very considerable.

Mr. JARMAN. I know my friend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio will not insist on that information under those circumstances.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; I gladly yield to my friend, colleague, and comrade from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have had inquiries from people who are interested in China Relief. They are concerned about the language on page 10 of the bill. The question has been asked by them—although they do not anticipate it would be done—whether under this any organization could say to China Relief, for example, "You cannot go into that." Could that language be interpreted, they being a foreign-relief organization, so that U. N. R. R. A. could say to China Relief, for some reason, or without reason, "You shan't go into a certain area." I cannot see how they could.

Mr. JARMAN. That is what I would say. Whether they could technically do it or not, I cannot conceive that they should, because this organization will need every help that it can get. The main purpose of the language to which the gentleman refers is to permit U. N. R. R. A. to supervise all relief. Its authority to do so will prevent organizations

well supplied with funds from procuring more of the short supplies than they are entitled to on the basis of the whole picture. U. N. R. R. A. will supervise that.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I wanted the answer in the Record for that purpose.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Gladly, to my friend.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I have a very high regard for the opinion of my good friend on matters of this kind, and that is why I ask the question whether or not he knows of any reason why lend-lease funds cannot be used to supplement any appropriations that might be made by virtue of this resolution.

Mr. JARMAN. Why lend-lease cannot be used?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. To supply appropriations under this resolution.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Lend-lease operates only on the request of the military authorities. It is a supplement to the Army and the Navy, coming directly behind them. They are really under military control as to what they distribute in the countries of which our armies are in possession.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Is it not a fact that lend-lease funds have been used for foreign relief already?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They have been used on the request of the military commander. They were used in Algeria on the request of General Eisenhower, who wanted instantly to give relief to some of the Algerians, for the benefit of his own troops, so that he would not have behind him a half-starved population.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. And that is done by the military only at the request of the military authorities?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Then a request of the Commander in Chief would be sufficient?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I suppose so.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. So that the President could allocate funds to supplement appropriations that might be made by virtue of this resolution?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suppose it could be said that he could do it, but if he should it would be stretching the intent of Congress and the understanding our committee had, that lend-lease appropriations were in support of the armed forces.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. It would not be the first time the intent of Congress had been stretched.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. I want to say in further reply to the gentleman from Ohio, do not overlook the fact that every dollar of that lend-lease money was American money. What we are trying to do is to get away from shouldering the entire

load and have some help in this relief. In this way we will get it.

Now, may I conclude? The administrative expense of lend-lease is contributed to by the United States to the extent of 40 percent instead of 60 percent. But I will not take time to go into that except to say that it results from the fact that those countries which have been occupied also contribute to administrative expense, and to state that other countries have already supplied \$700,000 on which U. N. R. R. A. is now commencing to operate. I cannot refrain from joining the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] in his reference to the American representatives of U. N. R. R. A. On the council is that able gentleman, Assistant Secretary of State Acheson, who, as you know, was selected as chairman of the first meeting of the council and who very evidently did an excellent job. America's interest, I believe, is in safe hands with Dean Acheson on that council. Then as Director General while he, of course, is a United Nations official and is by no means representing the United States in his capacity as Director General, I am sure that practically all, if not all the members of the committee, gained the same impression as did the gentleman from Ohio, that this distinguished gentleman, able executive, excellent public official, and financial expert of note, is an ideal man to handle the affairs of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Association. May I add that his testimony was that, aside from the humanitarian standpoint, it was very definitely good business policy for the United States. I am confident of your agreement with my opinion that Governor Lehman "knows his business."

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Texas, the ranking majority member of our committee.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. With reference to Governor Lehman, the Administrator, I want to corroborate what has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and also the gentleman from Ohio, that many members of the committee, including myself, had never had personal acquaintance with Governor Lehman until we began consideration of this legislation. I think that every one of those who met him and who heard him and talked with him and who heard him talk before our committee, were convinced of his capability and of his wisdom and of the fact that he was well qualified to do an excellent job as Administrator of this great organization. Of course, we have known Dean Acheson before and I also heartily share you gentlemen's high opinion of him.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman. I am sure his opinion is concurred in by all members of what I regard as our excellent committee.

Mr. Chairman, I illustrate the attitude of Director General Lehman, my attitude, and what I believe to be the attitude of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that is that, while the passage of this resolution will not create an utopia, and although we are fully cognizant of the

rocky road which confronts it, we are quite optimistic, by quoting from the hearings at the point where inquiry was made of me whether I had any questions to propound to Director General Lehman at the conclusion of his testimony:

Mr. JARMAN. Governor, as you pioneer along this new, broad, and uncharted course, which seems so pregnant with possibilities, your hopes are high, which attitude is shared not only by the membership of this committee but by the whole people of the United States and of the world. I simply wish to indulge the hope that in the final analysis it will develop that your expectations, yes, even your ambitions of this moment, may be abundantly fulfilled.

Governor LEHMAN. Thank you very much.

May I say to you that my hopes are high. I believe that this is a historic undertaking on which we are embarking, and one that has great possibilities, but I have no illusions whatsoever with regard to the difficulties. They will be very great and very numerous. I am very very alive to that fact.

Mr. JARMAN. You will note that my realization of that probability caused me to differentiate between expectations and ambitions. I said "expectations—even your ambitions."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished lady from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we have spent today, one of the 2 days given us, in the discussion of this resolution, which takes the United States for the first time into active participation in world affairs. We will be a part of the international group that want to mend, as much as can be mended quickly, the broken world.

You have already been told that this agreement began in 1941 with the discussions in London, and it grew bit by bit. When finally the United States became part of the objective war, this agreement was entered into. You will recall that last summer I brought it to your attention that such an agreement was under discussion and that the Foreign Affairs Committee was to have hearings with the Assistant Secretary of State. We had those hearings. The Senate had hearings and the changes were made as you have already been informed. I asked you particularly to take the agreement home with you on your holiday and study it, take it to your constituents and let them give you their opinions on it. I am wondering how many of you did so, knowing we are all desperately busy people with each one feeling his own committee work the most important.

We were invited, we members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to come to Atlantic City to participate in the plenary sessions. I believe one member went down for the opening; five members went down for the end; and I had the pleasure of going down, sort of midseason, over a week end, when I had opportunity, not to go to the plenary session, but to sit down with the members of the conference, members of the secretariat and some of the observers.

I want to say at this point it would be very difficult to find a more able group of people than were gathered together from our various departments and of the press as members of this secretariat. I am happy to have this opportunity of

expressing my appreciation and what I hope might be the appreciation of the House of Representatives for the very splendid type of people chosen and the magnificent service they gave. There was absolutely no suggestion on their part that the hours were long, and sometimes they worked all night and every night they worked very late.

But now I want to go out a little across the world. I do not think it is possible for us to consider this resolution without a background of what has happened to the state of mind and the state of body of the major part of the world. Europe has been decimated. It consists now of nothing but scorched earth and devastated—I was going to say "homes," but there are so few homes left. As the Germans swept across the whole of Europe they left behind them death and destruction. They kept only those things which they themselves wanted to use. They took back to Germany everything they needed, including human beings. They did everything possible to destroy the home, which is the foundation and the central point of living in all free lands. They created a situation such as the world has never seen, of starvation and destitution and horror, of indecency and of vileness. Now, I ask you, how can we who have still plenty to eat in spite of—well, shall I say—the stupidities of some of the things that are being done to us? We still have plenty. We have all the clothes we want. We certainly have all we need. How can we possibly understand the hearts and minds of those people—men, women, and children—who are not just hungry but are starving, and have been for years? Children wandering from one place to another in rags, always cold and wet, or scorched with the sun, from which they have no relief, children banded together for protection, like animals, suspicious and at the mercy of any passing horror. How can we possibly understand? And if we do not understand, how can we move into this picture intelligently and understandingly when we do not know what it is? Our wildest imaginings do not give us the sense of what those people have been suffering, and are suffering today.

We have been the only light in their darkness. As the Germans took over they closed the doors around them, and the only access they had to the world was the little secret short-wave sets whose discovery meant death. At our end were those who sent out short-wave messages in all the languages of the many occupied countries, that were as little candles, little flickers of light in their darkness. They learned to look to America and they still look to America.

Then finally we have sent our men. They know that there are several million of our boys and our girls with them, who have gone there to liberate them, to give them release from the oppressor, from the torture, from the agony. Do you mean to tell me that it is conceivable that we send our soldiers and then say "No; we will not help feed you; feed yourselves, get yourselves upon your own feet!" Do we not want them to want our boys there? Do we not want them to

welcome our soldiers? Do we not want them to open what houses they have and their hearts to our boys? Do we want them to draw away from us, as though we were something strange, impossible creatures without humanity or the milk of human kindness? I cannot believe that of us, nor can I believe that we as a nation and those of us who are here representing the people of this Nation, are going to be so short-sighted as to believe that to refuse this help, to refuse to be a party to giving them seeds to plant, to give them the little they need so that they can lift themselves up—I cannot believe that that sort of limitation is America, nor that it is the best for America, nor the right for America.

It is my conviction that America had better be very wise and look ahead, yes, look very far ahead. Do we want to be welcomed 10 years from now? Do we want friends across the Atlantic and the Pacific, or do we not? Are we so arrogant that we think we can live alone?

That is going to be an isolationism such as has never been in all the wide world! We will be so isolated that the cold of it will be unbelievable. I say to you that if we fail to continue to be a light in their darkness, the future will find us in a position where it will not be a question whether they need us; it will be that we shall need them! I cannot believe this Congress will be so short-sighted. I cannot believe that the people of this country will want to do anything less for themselves and the future than to play a vital, living, vivid part in this, our first venture into international responsibility. We are a young Nation. We are just children. Of course, we are going to make mistakes—dreadful ones. We are going to beat our heads against the wall because of some of them. We here in Congress cannot control the personnel; we cannot control the administration of this thing, but we can watch both and we can say to those responsible right here and now, "You be careful, because you are going to be held responsible. It is up to you to do this thing right. It is up to you to see to it that the name of America spells peace, that it spells relief, that it spells help, so that you can help yourself, you nations across the sea."

It seems to me that our obligation to our own children is so great that we should not hesitate an instant, regardless of the implications that are in the very words of the agreement and of our resolution. Of course, there are political implications. If you read the testimony you will find that I tried to follow that thought through; that I tried to seek it out so that we would not go into this thing blind to the fact that there are political implications. I say to you now, that unless there is very careful administration, very wise administration, we can readily be accused of having set up something quite appalling; something that would be against, rather than in the interests of, freedom. But in this resolution, in the agreement itself, you will find words that say, "There shall be no political use made of these supplies."

I asked the same questions of the Director General, not in the same words, as I had heard asked of the Assistant Secretary, whether he felt that we could keep free of political implication. He said it was the point and purpose of U. N. R. R. A. to keep free of them, and he proposed to do so to the fullest degree possible. Of course, it is possible that because the signatory nations, the fact that the signatories that represent the occupied countries are the governments-in-exile. There were no others. That does not mean that a new government may not be set up by these countries once they are free. I pursued that thought in my questioning, asking what would occur in such a case. It was explained that it is customary—and I am sure you knew it as I did—that when a government changes there is an interval before the new government receives recognition. In that interval there might be a serious relief situation. I asked the Director General if he thought that relief could be continued through that interval. His reply was to the effect that he would do everything possible that it should be so, emphasizing the fact that U. N. R. R. A. had nothing to do with governments, with their acceptance or their rejection.

Now, my point in this is very simple. I believe we of this Congress should support this resolution, but I believe we should do it with our eyes wide open. I believe that we have a great responsibility to open them wider every day. It would be quite possible for us to say blindly, "Yes; this is wonderful. We want to be a part of an international group" and let it go without examining into it. I do not consider that the way for us to function, nor do you.

I believe it to be my duty as a member of this Committee on Foreign Affairs to advise this Congress that there are political implications that we must watch; that there are possibilities of maladministration which may increase. But I believe also that the intent and purpose of the 44 nations is to see to it that politics, political pressures, the attempt to foist a government onto a people that no longer wants it, or insist upon a new government being accepted by the people, is not the meaning of U. N. R. R. A. I believe it is necessary that we recognize that fact here and now.

I believe it might be less embarrassing to the President if he were not given this money, because we shall hold him responsible if we give it to him, and we shall hold him responsible if there is any finagling politically. We shall have the right to, more, we shall have the duty. I think it is quite possible he would be in a far more secure position if the State Department, as has been suggested, or the Treasury Department, be given this money to use for U. N. R. R. A. I hope there will be very serious consideration given this by the House. I think, as I say, that it might be a far less embarrassing situation for the President of the United States or for any to whom he may delegate this job.

We have been told that F. E. A. would be given the job. I would like to protest, as a previous speaker has done, that it seems unwise to me to choose the

latest mushroom baby of a war government and give it such far-reaching authority, such a truly terrible responsibility in the new, wide world, because what we do is going to make such a difference. If U. N. R. R. A. fails—and it will not fail if we do our duty in the right way, but if it should fail—there could be chaos in the world because it is that immediate moment after the arms are laid down when the Army says to U. N. R. R. A.: "Now, come in and take these people to your heart and save them." It is that moment that is of such great importance.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The suggestion was made earlier this afternoon that U. N. R. R. A. was created in some way or other to help Uncle Joe Stalin. Is it not true that the situation in which communism grows and flourishes is an atmosphere of starvation, disease, misery, and the chaos caused by the first three and that U. N. R. R. A. and its relief work will tend to make an atmosphere where communism will not flourish?

Mrs. BOLTON. As I read history, revolutions, chaos, and anarchy of every kind grow best in a soil of starvation and suffering. In a well-administered U. N. R. R. A. I believe there is opportunity to bring to the world at the most critical moment in history that which will make possible the beginnings of a new world. Let us safeguard it—yes—but let us not fail to take our responsibilities within the great family of nations, true to our dreams of freedom and the light that is America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 192 to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders previously agreed to, I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House by a vote of 337 for and none against accepted your Military Affairs Committee bill to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces. Under the provisions of the House bill, the maximum amount to be paid for persons eligible would be \$300. Under the provisions of Senate bill 1543, the maximum to be paid would be \$500. In that respect and in other provisions of the House bill there are major differences. Many of your Members of the House on yesterday are recorded as voting for the committee bill knowing full well that the maximum sum was insufficient and inadequate.

Members of the Lemke committee, consisting of 51 Members of your House, unanimously approved a maximum of \$700. With this in mind and realizing that a committee of conference of the two branches will be appointed to confer on these differences in the bill, I sincerely hope that the Members of the House appointed by you, Mr. Speaker, will lend all their efforts to a maximum payment of \$500 as a compromise between the House committee bill and the so-called Lemke bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the membership of the House has been advised that some time during the next week the House will consider the soldiers' vote bill.

As a member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, I signed the minority report to accompany S. 1285.

I sincerely trust that each Member of the House will give careful study to both the majority and minority reports relative to this legislation.

The majority report was prepared by the ranking majority member of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and in his report he states that it will enable every qualified voter in our armed forces to vote by absentee ballot for State, county, and other local officials, as well as President, Vice President, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress.

He also states that as a rule men and women in the service are more interested in voting for their friends and relatives and members of their immediate families who are running for local offices than they are in voting for national officials.

Frankly, I do not believe that the men and women in our armed forces would prefer to vote for State, county, and local officials in preference to national officials.

In fact, in off-election years we find that only 50 percent of the people vote—and lots of times even less than that. However, when national elections are held we find that at least 80 percent of the people are voting and that the national candidates—by far—receive a larger number of votes than the State,

county, and local officials. Therefore, the argument that the soldier would prefer to vote for his friends, relatives, and members of his immediate family running for local offices does not, in my opinion, hold water.

We can only judge the future by the past, and experience, after all, is the best teacher, and on the basis of the number of votes cast in Presidential years in contrast to off-election years, the truth is that when national elections are held there is a far greater number of votes cast than in other elections.

Take, for instance, the total number of votes cast in the first district of Mississippi in 1942 for Representative in Congress—we find that there was only 7,079 votes cast for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], although the 1940 census figures for that district disclose that the district has a population of 263,367, and in that congressional district in the 1940 election—the Presidential election year—there was a total of 19,330 votes cast for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The figures I have just quoted establish the truth—at least insofar as the First District of Mississippi is concerned—as to the total number of votes cast in a Presidential year and the small number cast in off-election years.

Therefore, I submit to the Members of the House that the majority report, insofar as it states that the men and women in our armed forces would prefer to vote for State, county, and local officials in preference to national officials, is a misstatement of the truth and facts.

There is a difference between giving lip service to our veterans and the members of our armed forces and giving real service to the members of our armed forces. If we really want to give the members of our armed forces the right to vote, we must follow the advice that has been given us by the War and Navy Departments, and provide a simplified, uniform ballot distributed by the Federal authorities, with the customary local authorities counting and tabulating the votes of their respective soldier voters.

It has been estimated that 1 out of every 10 voters in a Congressional District is now in our armed forces—on that basis, there would be at least twenty-six or twenty-seven thousand soldier votes in the First District of Mississippi, and with the poll-tax restriction removed, and if ballots were placed under Federal supervision in the hands of the voters of that congressional district, even though only one-half of them voted, it could easily change the results of the election on the basis of the total number of votes cast in the last election.

The gentleman from Mississippi has taken the floor and accused Members wrongly of hampering action on this bill, and loudly declares that he wants the soldiers to have their vote. Why, then, is he covering up the weaknesses of this legislation?

The truth is, if the gentleman from Mississippi and the Members of this House really want the soldier to vote, you will support the Green-Lucas-Worley bill—and if you do not want the soldier to vote, you will then support S.

1285, as amended. Regardless of how loudly the gentleman from Mississippi—either on the floor of this House or by radio—declares he is in favor of the soldier vote, the true facts do not bear out his statements because it will be an utter impossibility to handle it through the States.

I believe that the members of our armed forces should be given the opportunity to exercise the right to vote and preserve those ideals for which they are fighting. If the members of our armed forces can be sent to the far-flung battlefields of this global war and be trusted to fire the guns, they certainly can be trusted to mark the ballot, and if they are good enough to fight and die for democracy, they are certainly good enough to vote in a Federal election. The members of our armed forces are fighting as American units and it is, in my opinion, the sacred duty of this Congress to provide them with a means of voting under Federal supervision.

We have been told by both the Army and Navy that it would not be possible for them to handle ballots containing the vast number of names necessary for State, county, and local officials; and then, too, some of the States under their constitutions do not permit absentee voting, and there is not sufficient time remaining to change the State constitutions. The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] dealt with that in detail in his very forceful address on January 11, 1944.

The Members who signed the minority report do not want to take away from the members of our armed forces the right to vote a State ballot, and the bill introduced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], on January 17, 1944, numbered H. R. 3982, specifically provides that nothing in his bill shall be deemed to restrict the right of any member of the armed forces of the United States to vote in accordance with the laws of the State of his residence.

I am not a lawyer, but I do know that this House, under the authority granted by the Constitution, enacted into law the Ramsey bill, which was approved on September 16, 1942, and is known as Public Law No. 712 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. That law provided the means by which the men and women in the armed forces could cast an absentee vote, and it specifically outlawed the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in Federal elections by any members of the armed forces who were otherwise qualified to vote. It also provided that a member of the armed forces desiring to vote was required to request a war ballot from the secretary of state of his State of residence, using a postal-card form supplied by the Army and Navy. Under this system, in 1942, when there was approximately 4,000,000 persons in our armed forces, the committee was informed that only 78,589 applications were received and that only 23,051 votes were cast.

It, therefore, follows that the only logical solution is to provide a uniform national ballot, and the Worley bill, H. R. 3982, in my opinion, contains the only effective provisions that will give to the

men and women in our armed forces of voting age the opportunity to exercise their right of franchise. If Congress had the right back in 1872 to enact legislation that provides that national elections shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, and if they had the right to enact the Ramsey bill into law in 1942, it would follow as a logical conclusion, as a matter of common sense, that the Congress does have the right to remove the barrier that exists between the members of our armed forces and the ballot box in their home precinct.

The newspaper correspondents writing from overseas tell us in their columns that the members of our armed forces desire to vote in the national elections this year, and from the tone of the columns I have read I have come to one conclusion—they are interested only in the national election. If the members of our armed forces desire to express their choice as to who shall be their national officials, I submit it is the duty of the Congress to provide them with the means to exercise their right to vote for the principles for which they are fighting, and I sincerely trust that this House—when the soldier vote is under consideration—will substitute the Worley bill, H. R. 3982, for S. 1285, as amended.

The provisions of the Worley bill, if adopted, will secure for the members of our armed forces an adequate servicemen's absentee voting privilege.

PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES IN UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations are fighting for freedom and democracy as outlined in the Atlantic Charter.

Men, women, and children of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Yugoslavia, Greece, and other small nations, are cruelly starved, abused, and mistreated by the Nazi hordes.

Among the great tragedies of mankind, few have equaled the ordeal of the children murdered by the Nazis. Their treatment of innocent children will be remembered for centuries to come.

Their dire plight should evoke not only our deepest sympathy, but also our fullest help. The victims of war must be fed as soon as possible. Chaos and anarchy, caused by human suffering, would endanger all of us. Permanent reconstruction of devastated areas and the reestablishment of currencies, are different types of problems and can be met later, but relief from suffering, food, clothing, shelter, and recovery of their health, must be taken care of immediately.

In the name of humanity, I appeal to the membership of this House to pass favorably the legislation before us. We, as a God-fearing Nation, must carry out the precepts of our Heavenly Father, to

feed the hungry and clothe the naked. By doing this we will be helping to pave the way for a real and lasting peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the grapevine in the House recently has indicated that many Members hope to avoid a roll-call vote on the real issue presented by the soldiers' voting bill. They rely upon the rules of the House which, designed to protect the minority party, may, under the unusual legislative situation, be used to hide from the people how the Members ballot upon this important question. Let me recite briefly the background.

In the Committee for the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], sponsored a bill which would have provided Federal machinery to give the servicemen a practical opportunity of voting. Ordinarily it might be assumed that this bill, with the sponsorship of the chairman and the support of the majority membership of the committee, would be reported out to the House. But several members of his party joined with the solid Republican minority to report out a bill which, although piously approving of the right of the soldiers to ballot, frustrated any practical chance they might have of voting by leaving the arrangements for the vote to the conflicting laws of the 48 States. This second bill is currently before the Rules Committee. Under the usual rule granted by the Rules Committee two roll calls would be in order—that upon the motion to recommit and that upon final passage. It is to be presumed that the Worley bill, sponsored by the chairman, will be offered as a substitute upon the floor. This will, however, be in Committee of the Whole where no roll-call votes may be had. Should the substitute bill be defeated by a voice vote in the Committee of the Whole, it will be finally lost for when the committee arises and the House resumes its deliberations no roll-call vote can be asked for upon a defeated amendment. The motion to recommit gives no aid to the proponents of the Worley bill for it has always been held to be first available to the minority party and, as I have said, the minority members of the House Committee on Elections are opposed to the Worley bill. A straight motion to recommit, which presumably will be offered by one of them, would not give an opportunity to the House to express itself upon the fundamental question in this case. A vote on final passage does not pose the question between a Federal ballot and an ineffective State ballot, but rather the question as to whether the Members wish or not the servicemen to have the right to vote at all. It is thus seen that the real question in the case will never be passed upon by a roll-call vote. Members who would not like to be recorded as being opposed to an effective soldiers' voting bill can defeat

the Worley amendment in committee and avoid placing their position on record before their constituents and before the country.

Should the House adopt this procedure and, as I say there is considerable conversation that such is the hope of some of its Members, in my mind it will be a cowardly strategy to employ and one which will reflect discredit not only upon the Members who are unwilling to be recorded but upon Congress itself. We must be branded before the public as an assembly of buck passers and legislative "milk-toasts" if we shirk our responsibility in this vote. No Member has control of the vote of another Member. If some feel the Worley bill to be unnecessary or unconstitutional, even though I completely disagree with their position, I must respect them if they stand up openly and support their position on a roll call but I certainly think that we owe it to the people and to the servicemen to express ourselves unequivocally and as a matter of permanent record.

There is a sound reason for the provisions of the usual rule from the Rules Committee of which I have spoken. It was designed to protect the minority party but where, as in this case, several members of the majority have joined with the minority party and reported out their own bill, there is no reason why the question to recommit should be granted to those who are really in favor of the bill. Those who favor the Worley bill should likewise be granted a motion to recommit and to report back the Worley bill forthwith. Thus a record vote could be obtained. There is one chance we have to avoid this injustice and to redeem the House from the criticism which will surely be made—that we are dodging important issues and not playing fair with our soldiers. The Rules Committee should grant a rule allowing an additional roll call—that upon the Worley amendment. This procedure would be unusual but it is not unprecedented. As the House remembers, it was employed at the time of the controversy upon the Ruml plan. I understand that such a rule was likewise granted in the case of a bill sponsored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. I hope that every Member, regardless of his vote and party, will support such a rule. It is only common fair play. In case this rule is not granted, and some of the Members are thus able to shirk their obligation, I think that the public should know the facts and it is for this reason I have addressed the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS CONTRASTED WITH BUNGLING

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, probably never before since man started to record the progress of life and civilization has history marched with such giant strides. But, in this breathless, headlong march of events, this acceleration of the usual plodding progress of history, it is pretty easy to become be-

wildered, a trifle surfeited perhaps, and even a bit jaded.

Epic events as a steady day-to-day diet make tough going for our mental digestive systems. It is inevitable and understandable that it becomes exceedingly difficult to appraise accurately the deep and lasting worth and import of each historic happening. But difficult as it is, it is wise, indeed almost obligatory, that we particularly try to make such an appraisal; that we take stock; that we put a fair yardstick to the measurement of our accomplishments and our progress.

In my humble judgment, now, this very day, is a proper time for such a stock taking. Recently, the final period has been put to another tremendous chapter in the history of this war. This newest chapter came to its close within the past month, and the ending, thanks to a benevolent Providence, is a happy ending.

I refer, gentlemen, to the recent return—in safety, in good health, and in justified good spirits—of our Commander-in-Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I dare say it is now quite generally known that the Commander-in-Chief has been on a little business trip; that amongst other people he met and did business with were Winston Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek, and a Mr. Joseph Stalin.

Many of the military plans made in those momentous meetings in Cairo and Teheran, and the times and dates when those plans will begin to unfold, must remain in the safety of strict military secrecy until that secrecy is broken, not by words, but by earth-rocking action. We know how dearly certain men in Berlin—or what remains of Berlin—and Tokyo would love to know what was said and decided in those meetings, not, I feel fairly sure, that the knowledge would greatly comfort them. But we also know that we have no intentions of feeding their hunger for this knowledge by too much questioning at this time, or too deep probing, or even the innocent pastime of speculation.

Yes, we all know that for the time being, and every indication is that the time will not be long, these things of military value to the enemy must remain secret. Even if they were known, even if the world knew every minute fact of each meeting, it would still be impossible to assess the full weight in world affairs of those meetings. Time alone can make a proper assessment of the place of events in the over-all pattern of history.

Time alone can provide the perspective that enables us to weave an event with what went before it and what followed it. Only then, when it becomes a link in the chain of history, can we evaluate it properly. But we need not wait and should not wait to get our perspective clear on what went before those meetings, on the events and progress that culminated inevitably in the meeting of the minds and the persons of the four greatest leaders in the world today. In connection with this, it is particularly fitting that recent

history be reviewed, for the picture has been getting blurred and the perspective has been getting fuzzy, the public understanding of the scope and progress of this war has been getting considerably frayed at the edges.

This we do know—that the historic conferences fit into a pattern of accomplishment and wisdom that has already made this war known as America's best-run war. Yes; it is already an established historical fact that this is our best-managed and most efficiently run, most brilliantly fought war in our whole history as a nation. It is good that it is, because it is also the greatest trial in our whole history as a nation. It is our best-run war on the far away battlefields that are stretched across the world. It is also our best-run war here at home. Practically no one will deny the superb job that has been done on the military and diplomatic fronts away from our shores.

The news and the concrete accomplishments do not permit of such denial. Neither does the overwhelming pride that the American people have in these accomplishments permit of their criticism. But here at home a well-organized and lavishly financed campaign of detraction has been hard at work trying to make the home front—the folks here at home—believe that the same American leaders who admittedly are directing things so efficiently and brilliantly in Italy, England, Asia, India, on the Atlantic and the Pacific, and in the air over Europe, cannot handle things properly in San Francisco, Brooklyn, Kennebunkport, and Amarillo. And especially not in Washington. Well, maybe Washington is the toughest battleground of all, but it seems to me quite a lot is being accomplished even here.

I understand a highly paid publicity man even worked out a strategy for this campaign of detraction, a strategy revolving around the use of the theme word "bungling," the idea being to mess up things here at home by trying to convince the public that everything is wrong, all sacrifices and inconveniences unnecessary, every effort toward the successful prosecution of the war a bungling effort. I must say I cannot admire the patriotism of a man who would undertake such an assignment at this time and evolve such a strategy. A noble fellow! I also cannot admire the patriotism of those who carry out this strategy, who furnish the money for it, and who broadcast it.

But, fortunately, it is not going to work. The American people can be confused and befuddled for a while. It is possible for clever people to organize clever strategy—especially when they have millions to put behind that strategy—to pull the wool over the public eye. But the bungling campaign shows definite signs of having become a bit of a bungle itself. It does not make sense to the average sensible person that the same leadership could operate so brilliantly abroad and bungle everything it put its hands to here at home.

I did not invent the idea that this is America's best-run war, or even the phrase. As a matter of fact, no Demo-

crat invented it. To my knowledge, the first person to use it publicly was a Republican who once ran for the office of Vice President of the United States on the Republican ticket. He is still a Republican—but he has withdrawn from the political battle for the time being to devote himself wholeheartedly to the much larger and more vital battle that his country is engaged in. I refer to Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox. Mr. Knox, to my knowledge, was the first person to declare this America's best-run war.

We have had brilliant leadership and leaders in the Pacific, in Australia, in the Solomons, in the Gilberts, in the Aleutians, in Africa and Italy, in England, over Europe, and in the incredibly successful battle of the Atlantic against the submarine menace.

We have had brilliant leadership and leaders who have solved the fantastically difficult problem of supplying these many armies and men over miles of hostile water, and through miles of hostile air.

We have had brilliant leadership and leaders to work with industry and labor in attaining the greatest production record of all time—a production record that not so many months ago was deemed so impossible that our enemies had high hopes and our friends great apprehensions. We have had brilliant leadership and leaders in the tough, knotty fight against inflation and in the preserving of equality in the distribution of necessarily scarce goods here at home. These leaders have been drawn from every segment of American life and from all shades of political belief. No one political party, no one economic stratum, no one classification of American life can claim credit for all or even most of it. That is the way it should be. That is the way a democratic war, a people's war, an American war, should be run. And that, it should be remembered, is the way President Roosevelt has chosen to run this war. Let us not lose sight of the fact that he is the Commander-in-Chief. He is the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and the Commander-in-Chief of the Navy. He is the Commander-in-Chief—of the war front and the home front and the diplomatic front. He is the leader of the leaders.

He is the Commander-in-Chief of America's best-run war. We deeply, warmly, affectionately welcome his return to active duty after his slight illness following his recent arduous and historic journey, and we give sincere thanks that he came back safely to continue as our Commander-in-Chief until America's best-run war ends with America's best-planned peace.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 470. An act to implement article 23 of the Convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation for commercial or other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The House Committee on Banking and Currency will meet at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, January 21, 1944, to consider the bill H. R. 3873, introduced by Mr. PATMAN.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The hearings on H. R. 2596, to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1 will be continued on Friday, January 21, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, January 25, and Wednesday, January 26, 1944, on H. R. 2701, H. R. 3012, H. R. 3446, and H. R. 3489.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 3, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2652, to amend section 222 (e) of subtitle "Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936," as amended.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1007. Report on the disposition of certain papers by certain agencies of the Federal Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1008. Report on the disposition of certain papers by certain agencies of the Federal Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1009. Report on the disposition of certain papers by certain agencies of the Federal Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 4025. A bill relating to the tax liability of members of the armed forces for taxable years beginning prior to their entering such forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4026. A bill to provide that veterans of the Second World War upon separation from the land or naval forces be furnished with certain information with respect to their national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4027. A bill to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, to authorize certain hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men of the armed forces who are peacetime veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. Res. 403. Resolution making S. 1285, a bill to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4028. A bill for the relief of John Burl Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4427. By Mr. HERTER: Petition signed by sundry residents of Newton, Mass., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating liquors during the present war and for several months thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4428. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Rev. R. T. Cookingham, of Monroe, and 29 other citizens of Benton County, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4429. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mary B. Cunningham and other residents of Chester, W. Va., urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4430. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Department of Agriculture of Austin, Tex., relative to subsidies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 11, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the creative faith by which we really live we come to Thee, who art the source of all excellence, with the assurance that in Thy sight Thy children under all skies have a value and a worth independent of any earthly allegiance. The very justice and social welfare we are here as public servants to preserve, promote, and protect is rooted and grounded in Thy sovereignty. Against the debasing idolatry of the

god-state which, instead of altars of prayer, rears prisons of the mind and heart, we have pledged our all. Even as we face the forces of evil with the sword of our material might we know that more vital than earthly armament, if we are to be the instruments of Thy purpose, is the putting on of the whole armor of God; for only as we put on that shining mail can we fight and pray for the peace and good will of the world-wide family of God.

In this Thy glorious day we commit our cause, our allies, our country, and ourselves into Thy hands, praying that, unworthy though we be, Thou wilt use us to defeat the defiling blasphemies which defy Thy kingdom, keeping us brave, nerving us for sacrifice, and crowning our effort at last with the triumph of the high aims for which we fight—the establishment of a brotherhood of nations where justice and truth and freedom shall be secure in all the earth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 20, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the order of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22, next.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF STERLING HUTCHESON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on the 28th day of January 1944, at 10:30 a. m. in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Sterling Hutcheson, of Virginia, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADDRESS THE SENATE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that next Monday, or at the first session of the Senate after the conclusion of the consideration of the pending tax bill, I shall make a few remarks in reply to the address made yesterday by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.